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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to improve the understanding of the present situation and the key problems regarding the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past. Another aim was to investigate roles and initiatives undertaken by key stakeholders and recommend key areas for measures and action to enhance the conservation and protection of designed landscapes of the recent past. The emphasis of the research was on the United Kingdom but relevant findings and actions from an international context were included. A qualitative method was applied using the between-method triangulation research methodology, which combined two methods of investigation, namely data triangulation and theory triangulation. Theory triangulation allowed for an investigation of the wider context or 'the general' and a comparison of findings from published sources and records, including an examination of the existing inventories and the roles and initiatives of key stakeholders. The data triangulation used a case study survey, with questionnaires and interviews, to enable the collection and analysis of data from different categories of stakeholders from a site-specific perspective or 'the particular' context. The case study survey investigated eleven case study sites using questionnaires and interviews. A total of 146 respondents were contacted and 103 completed responses were received.

The results revealed that several recommendations for actions to improve the conservation and protection of heritage of the recent past exist, and that general conservation principles and methodologies exist for the conservation of designed landscapes, but that a lack of recognition and awareness for the significance of designed landscapes of the recent past results in poor implementation of such principles, and the continuing destruction and disfigurement of significant sites. The findings of the study led in the conclusions to the preparation of recommendations for measures and actions by stakeholders, to improve the protection and conservation of landscapes of the recent past.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the De Montfort University for having facilitated this opportunity through their research bursary and travel grants. My sincere thanks and gratitude to my supervisors at De Montfort University. Their support, encouragements and experience has been crucial throughout this project. Dr Judith Roberts, Dr Jan Birksted and the late Professor Dennis Radford took me through the initial stages of the research and Dr Obas John Ebohon has been most helpful in the final stages of the work. I would also like to thank Dr Ahmad H Taki as second supervisor at De Montfort University, and Dr Jan Woudstra at the University of Sheffield for his support as external supervisor.

I would like to thank the numerous people at the various organisations, companies and institutions for their assistance and contributions. I wish to thank especially DOCOMOMO and their Scottish National Group, the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscape, ICOMOS United Kingdom, English Heritage, the Little Sparta Trust, the Gibberd Garden Trust and the United States National Park Service. Thank you to the National Trust for Scotland, in particular the Gardens and Designed Landscapes Team and the Trust’s Gardens and Designed Landscapes Advisory Panel.

My gratitude to Peter Goodchild at GARLAND, Charlie Pepper and Margie Coffin Brown at the Olmsted Centre for Landscape Preservation of the National Park Service, Allen Paterson, Alistair Aitkin, Jacquie Milham, Ben Lyte, Veronica Barrington, and Kristina Taylor for their support, encouragements and feedback.

I particularly am grateful to everyone at the gardens, parks and landscapes that were visited and studied for the research. Day after day everyone is looking after these places with tremendous dedication and commitment. Your sites inspired this study and the many conversations informed much of the research. Thank you for all your help.

I am greatly indebted to everyone who participated in the case study surveys and took the time to complete a questionnaire or be interviewed. These surveys were crucial for the research. My gratitude to all friends and colleagues who have had so much patience along the way, and were always there to sit through another conversation.

Acknowledgements
about the thesis, or were ready to drag me away from the research when desperately needed.

Last but not least, this research would not have been possibly without the support, encouragement and patience of my parents and family.

Thank you to everyone for your continuous support, for sharing your knowledge and experience, and for steering the research into the right direction.
CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 3
CONTENTS 5
LIST OF FIGURES 12
LIST OF TABLES 17

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION 19
1.1 Research problem statement 19
1.2 Research proposition 23
1.3 Research objectives 23
1.4 Organisation of the thesis 23

CHAPTER TWO - THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW 27
2.1 Introduction 27
2.2 A gradual change of attitude to the recent past 27
2.3 Initial initiatives on landscapes of the recent past from 1995 33
2.4 Emphasis on material and technological challenges of buildings of the recent past 36
2.5 International initiatives on landscapes of the recent past from 2000 38
2.6 Increased focus on landscapes of the recent past in the United Kingdom from 2000 40
2.7 The momentum stagnates 43
2.8 Conclusions 44

CHAPTER THREE - CONSERVATION AND DESIGNED LANDSCAPES OF THE RECENT PAST 46
3.1 Introduction 46
3.2 Defining designed landscapes 46
3.2.1 Landscape characteristics 47
3.2.2 Setting and surroundings 48
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Cultural landscapes</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Defining the recent past</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Traditional and novel landscape types and styles</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Main categories of designed landscapes of the recent past</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Defining conservation</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.1 International charters and principles and the conservation of</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designed landscapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.2 The conservation process</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Categories of main stakeholders involved in the conservation of</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designed landscapes of the recent past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Key roles of stakeholder categories</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.1 Government authorities and agencies</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.2 Charitable trusts and voluntary organisations</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.3 Enterprises and consultants</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.4 Private and public repositories</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.5 Training and educational institutions</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.6 Day to day management</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.7 Wider public and visitors</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Conclusions</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER FOUR - METHODOLOGY</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Introduction</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Chosen Methodology: A qualitative methodology</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Appropriate research method: Case study method</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Methods of Data Collection</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1 Triangulation</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2 Questionnaires</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.3 Interviews</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Survey questions</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Survey themes</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Approval Ethics Committee</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Data analysis method</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Selection of case study sites</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Selection of respondents</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10.1 Targeted respondents groups for the case study sites</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.10.2 Age groups
4.10.3 Targeted number of surveys
4.11 Total number of responses
4.12 Number of respondents for each case study site
4.13 Total number of items mentioned in the responses
4.14 Responses by main themes
4.15 Responses by categories of issues
4.16 Experiences during field work
4.17 Conclusions

CHAPTER FIVE - THE CONTINUING DESTRUCTION AND DISFIGUREMENT OF SIGNIFICANT SITES
5.1 Introduction
5.2 Physical neglect and poor maintenance of sites
5.3 Inappropriate disfigurements of sites
5.4 Destruction of sites
5.5 Conclusions

CHAPTER SIX - THE CURRENT STATUS OF REGISTERS AND INVENTORIES
6.1 Introduction
6.2 The Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England
   6.2.1 The establishment of a thirty year rolling rule
   6.2.2 Post-1945 sites on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest
   6.2.3 Thematic research to underpin the Register
   6.2.4 Heritage Protection Review
6.3 The Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland
6.4 The National Register of Historic Places, United States
6.5 DOCOMOMO Registers
   6.5.1 DOCOMOMO National and Regional Registers
   6.5.2 DOCOMOMO International Selection
   6.5.3 DOCOMOMO and the UNESCO World Heritage List
   6.5.4 DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group Urban Register pilot project
   6.5.5 DOCOMOMO at Risk Lists
7.4 Conclusions

7.4.1 Conclusions in relation to the existing recommendations 218
A. Survey, analysis and evaluation of sites 219
B. Legal protection and listing 219
D. Promotion, Raising Awareness and Communication 220
E. Understanding technological and material challenges 221
F. Understanding the wider context of landscape architecture of the recent past 221
G. Use of established methods and principles 221
H. Cooperation and partnerships 222
I. Development of national strategies 223
J. Monitor and record keeping 223
K. Consultation and participation 223
L. Training and education 224
M. Funding 224

7.4.2 General conclusions 225

CHAPTER EIGHT - ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF THE CASE STUDY SURVEY 229

8.1 Introduction 229

8.2 Awareness and recognition 230
8.2.1 People’s opinions of landscapes of the recent past 230
8.2.1.1 Not everyone has an opinion 230
8.2.1.2 Not everyone has a low opinion 232
8.2.1.3 Opinions of people and the general public also change and evolve 235
8.2.2 Impacts of lack of awareness and recognition 238
Lack of recognition impacts the legal protection of sites 238
Effects of lack of awareness on funding for sites 239

8.3 Concerns about management and maintenance of sites 239
8.3.1 Maintenance concerns 240
8.3.1.1 Low opinions caused by poor maintenance of sites 240
8.3.1.2 Threats to sites due to poor maintenance 241
8.3.1.3 Continuity and commitment 242
8.3.1.4 Lower expectations of maintenance in public spaces 244
8.3.1.5 Staffing levels and equipment for maintenance 245
8.3.1.6 Impacts of design and understanding on maintenance 248
8.3.1.7 High cost of maintenance 249
8.3.1.8 Taking into account environmental friendly approaches and climate change 249
8.3.2 Management concerns 250

8.4 Concerns about finance and budgets 253
8.4.1 Insufficient funds 253
8.4.2 Dissatisfaction over wasted funds 255
8.4.3 Concerns over funding partnerships 256
8.4.4 Fundraising challenges 257
8.4.5 The influence of finance and budgets on opinions 258

8.5 Challenges associated with materials and design 259
8.5.1 Challenges associated with impractical and experimental design 260
8.5.2 The influence of design on opinions 261
8.5.3 Challenges associated with materials and planting 270
8.5.4 The influence of materials on opinions 273

8.6 Shortcoming in conservation planning and development processes 276
8.6.1 Issues with the planning process and understanding 276
8.6.2 Development versus original design 280
8.6.3 Issues with what is driving planning and development decisions 283
8.6.4 The influence of planning and development processes on opinions 287

8.7 Challenges with consulting and involving people 289
8.7.1 Responses relating to who should be involved and consulted 289
8.7.2 General concerns about the involvement of people 290
8.7.3 The influence of involvement of people on public opinions about landscapes of the recent past 291

8.8 Concerns about legal protection and politics 293
8.9 Concerns about social problems and vandalism 296
8.10 Concerns about marketing and commercialisation 299
8.11 Concerns about education, enjoyment, interpretation and access 300
8.11.1 Education and Interpretation 301
8.11.2 Enjoyment and access 302

8.12 Conclusions 307

CHAPTER NINE - FINAL CONCLUSIONS 313
9.1 Key findings and recommendations

9.1.1 Recommendations for the wider context

9.1.2 Recommendations for the site-specific context

9.1.3 Recommendations relating to stakeholders

9.2 Further research

9.3 The need to act now

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 - Table 2.1: A comparison of recommendations for the conservation of heritage and designed landscapes of the recent past

APPENDIX 2 - Questionnaire: The conservation of post-1945 Landscape Architecture

APPENDIX 3 - Table 4.5: List of respondents (by targeted response groups)

APPENDIX 4 - Table 7.2: A chronological overview of key initiatives by stakeholder organisations acting at an international level

APPENDIX 5 - Table 7.3: A chronological overview of key initiatives by stakeholder organisations acting at a national level

APPENDIX 6 - Table 8.1: A comparison between key findings from the literature review and the case study survey

APPENDIX 7 - Publication: Landscapes of the recent past: Identifying key problems regarding the conservation of designed landscapes

APPENDIX 8 - Poster Display: Battling For Modernism - Rethinking and safeguarding a significant recent landscape at the Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Site

APPENDIX 9 - Short Paper: Battling For Modernism - Rethinking and safeguarding a significant recent landscape at the Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Site

APPENDIX 10 - Research Report: Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Site - The Development of Bannockburn Since 1930 by the National Trust for Scotland
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 1: Michael Spens’ book on Sir Geoffrey Jellicoe, illustrating the Paradise Garden and the moat, Sutton Place, Surrey (Spens, 1994).</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 2: Jane Brown’s book on the Modern Garden, with the Ludwig Gerns’ own garden in Hanover, Germany (Brown, 2000).</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 3: Harlow Water Gardens at risk in 2002 (Twentieth Century Society, 2002).</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 4: Charles Birnbaum and the Cultural Landscape Foundation have been campaigning against the destruction of modernist masterpieces, such as the NCNB Plaza in Tampa, Florida, designed by Dan Kiley and completed in 1988 (Birnbaum, 2003c).</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 5: The English Heritage exhibition on ‘The Age of Optimism: Post-war Architecture in England 1945-70’ with on the poster cover the Leicester University Engineering Building by Stirling and Gowan (1953-63) and the Elephant and Rhinoceros Pavilion at London Zoo, by Casson, Condor and Partners (1962-65) (Saint, 1994).</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 6: Cover of the English Heritage brochure of 1996 on ‘Something Worth Keeping? Post War Architecture in England’. Illustrating the Severn Bridge, Avon, by Freeman, Fox and Partners (1961-66), the Epidauros, St Ives, Cornwall, by Barbara Hepworth (1961), and Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, City of London, by Chamberlain, Powell and Bon (1958-61) (Harwood, 1996).</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 7: Proceedings of the 1995 Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture Conference in Wave Hill, New York. The cover photo illustrates the U.S. Air Force Academy Air Gardens in Colorado Springs, Colorado, by Dan Kiley Landscape Architects realised in 1959 (Birnbaum, 1999b).</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 8: Papers of the first Twentieth Century conference in the United Kingdom in the Garden History Journal, with the pedestrian walkways at Byker, Newcastle upon Tyne (Woudstra and Ratti, 2000).</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 9: Proceedings of the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture Conference II, 2002, on the theme of Making Postwar Landscapes Visible, showing the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miller Garden, Columbus, Indiana, designed by Dan Kiley in 1955 (Birnbaum et al., 2004).

Fig. 10: The Wave Hill Charter 2002 (Birnbaum et al., 2004).

Fig. 11: Sir Frederick Gibberd’s Water Gardens in Harlow New Town before their relocation (Gibberd Garden Trust, 2004).

Fig. 12: Sir Frederick Gibberd’s Water Gardens at Harlow New Town in 2006 after relocation for retail development (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 13: The Garden History Society online collaborative research effort on post-war Gardens (Garden History Society, 2008c).

Fig. 14: Landscaping at the Lincoln Centre, New York, by Dan Kiley, 1960 (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 15: Dereliction of the landscaping of the Commonwealth Institute in London. A 1958 building commission for the architectural firm of Sir Robert Matthew, Johnson-Marshall & Partners (RMJM), with landscape design by Dame Sylvia Crowe (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 16: Urgent need of repairs of the landscaping of the Commonwealth Institute in London in 2006 (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 17: Loss of detail in the ‘wavy lawn’ at the Museum of Modern Art in the Parque do Flamengo in Rio de Janeiro, designed by Roberto Burle Marx (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 18: The campaign to save the Farnsworth House in Plano, Illinois, designed by Mies van der Rohe and completed in 1951 (Landmarks Illinois, 2003).

Fig. 19: The re-developed Christopher Columbus Park. It caused the destruction and renaming of Sasaki Associates’ Waterfront Park in Boston (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 20: Lawrence Halprin’s iconic sculpture garden at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond, Virginia, was being destroyed for the extension of the museum (Birnbaum, 2003c).

Fig. 21: Landform from 2002 by Charles Jencks at the Gallery of Modern Art, Edinburgh (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 22: A sketch by Eric Stevenson of the proposal from 1962 for the development of the Bannockburn Heritage site with the Rotunda and visitor facilities (Wemyss, 1962).

Fig. 23: Bannockburn Rotunda in the 1960s (Scott, 1964).
Fig. 24: Bannockburn Rotunda with interpretive signs in the 1960s (Macpherson, 1964).

Fig. 25: The Robert the Bruce statue and Rotunda at Bannockburn at present (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 26: Little Sparta, created by Ian Hamilton Finlay, in Lanarkshire, Scotland (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 27: The Garden of Cosmic Speculation at Portrack, Dumfriesshire, Scotland (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 28: St. Peter’s College, Cardross, Scotland on the World Monuments Fund’s annual list of hundred endangered sites in 2008 (World Monuments Fund, 2008a).

Fig. 29: ICOMOS’s International Day on Monuments and Sites 2002 on conserving Twentieth Century heritage (ICOMOS, 2002).

Fig. 30: UNESCO World Heritage Centre action towards the identification and documentation of Modern heritage (Van Oers and Haraguchi, 2003).

Fig. 31: Brasilia, Brazil, one of the post-1945 sites on UNESCO’s World Heritage List (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 32: The 2006 Heritage at Risk Report also concentrated on the Soviet Heritage and European Modernism (Haspel et al., 2006).

Fig. 33: The Joan Miró Foundation in Barcelona on the World Monuments Fund’s annual list of hundred endangered sites in 2008 (World Monuments Fund, 2008a).

Fig. 34: Joan Miró Foundation in Barcelona, designed by Josep Lluís Sert in 1975 (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 35: Marvels of Modernism as the 2008 theme on Landslide web pages of the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2007).

Fig. 36: Naumkeag, Massachusetts, United States, a marvel of Modernism, designed by Fletcher Steele (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 37: The Landscape Design Trust’s monograph on Sylvia Crowe (Collens and Powell, 1999).

Fig. 38: The Landscape Design Trust’s monograph Peter Shepheard (Downs, 2004).

Fig. 39: Richard Dattner’s renovated Adventure Playground in Central Park, New York (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 40: Sarah Allaback’s book on Mission 66 visitor centres (Allaback, 2000).
Fig. 41: Project to map careers, occupations and skills required for the management and maintenance of botanic and historic gardens (E3 Marketing Limited, 2005).

Fig. 42: ‘Stewardship through Education’ and the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2006c).

Fig. 43: Constructing the Swiss Landscape at Harvard University Graduate School of Design, 2006 (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 44: Sir Frederick Gibberd’s private garden in Harlow New Town (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 45: Little Sparta, the garden of Ian Hamilton Finlay (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 46: Art of the Garden Exhibition 2004 (Tate Britain, 2004).

Fig. 47: Stirling University’s pleasant and much appreciated landscaping (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 48: Stirling University Campus (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 49: Suntrap’s mixture of styles, with the modernist house and traditional garden buildings that were designed by Sir Robert Matthew (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 50: Pitmedden’s formal parterres in a traditional style, created by the National Trust for Scotland in the 1950s (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 51: Suntrap Garden, Gogarbank, Edinburgh (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 52: Dunbar’s Close Garden, Edinburgh (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 53: The Seafar neighbourhood in Cumbernauld New Town (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 54: The Pond Garden at Falkland Palace (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 55: The pebble-bottomed pool at Scottish Widows, Edinburgh, designed by Sylvia Crowe (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 56: The Garden of Cosmic Speculation at Portrack (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 57: Subtle, minimal landscaping around the house at High Sutherland (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 58: Detail of the paths and a stone wall at High Sutherland, a residence designed by Peter Womersley (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 59: The landscaping around the Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 60: The Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh, by Enric Mirrales (Author’s photograph).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Sir Robert Matthew’s original concept sketches from about 1961 for the Rotunda at Bannockburn (Matthew, 1961).</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>The Gibberd Garden’s Castle and Moat makes use of experimental materials (Author’s photograph).</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>The original Lupin Border at Falkland Palace in 1956 (National Trust for Scotland, 1956).</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Challenging designs with the use of contemporary materials at Portrack, the Garden of Cosmic Speculation (Author’s photograph).</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Intrusive housing developments at the edge of the Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Site (Author’s photograph).</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>The Bannockburn development proposals from 2004 included a tower and helmet-like visitor centre (Allan Murray Architects, 2004).</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>The initial masterplan for the Bannockburn redevelopment proposals from 2004 included a saltire-like landscaping layout (Allan Murray Architects, 2004).</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>The swing park near Seafar, Cumbernauld, near woods and a significant distance away from housing (Author’s photograph).</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Safety and vandalism remains a concern about the Rotunda at Bannockburn (Author’s photograph).</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Narrow paths at Little Sparta (Author’s photograph).</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Access arrangements and the annual opening period at Little Sparta (Author’s photograph).</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 2.1: A comparison of recommendations for the conservation of</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heritage and designed landscapes of the recent past (Appendix 1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.1: A comparison of classifications to inform a typology for</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designed landscapes of the recent past.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.2: A list of experts involved in conservation (Fielden and</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jokilehto, 1993).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.3: Categories of stakeholders that play a role in the</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.1: The selected case study sites</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.2: Targeted Respondents Groups and response rates for each</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.3: Response rate by age groups.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.4: Statistical conclusions of the responses to the surveys.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.5: List of Respondents (by targeted respondent groups) (Appendi</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s 3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.6: Response rate by Case Study Site.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.7: Responses by main themes.</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.8: Main categories of issues raised in the case study survey.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.9: Number of replies by categories of issues.</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6.1: Post-1945 sites on the Register of Parks and Gardens of</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Historic Interest (English Heritage, 2003b).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6.2: Thematic research by English Heritage for the Register of</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6.3: Post-1945 sites on the Inventory of Gardens and Designed</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscapes in Scotland (Historic Scotland, 2007c).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6.4: Modern heritage properties (Nineteenth and Twentieth</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centuries) on the UNESCO World Heritage List as at July 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(UNESCO, 2003).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6.5: Post-1945 heritage properties added to the UNESCO World</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage List by 2008 (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2008a).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7.1: Overview of key stakeholder organisations acting at an</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7.2: A chronological overview of the key initiatives by</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International by stakeholder organisations acting at an international</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level (Appendix 4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3: A chronological overview overview of key initiatives by stakeholder organisations acting at a national level (Appendix 5). 387

Table 7.4: Overview of key stakeholder organisations acting at a national level. 180

Table 7.5: Chronological overview of founding dates of key specialist committees and pressure groups. 190

Table 7.6: Comparison between the measures of the European Landscape Convention and key recommended areas of action as concluded in Chapter Two. 192

Table 8.1: A comparison between key findings from the literature review and the case study survey (Appendix 6). 392
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research problem statement

In recent years designed landscapes from the recent past appear to have gained recognition as significant heritage. This, at least, is the impression one gets when seeing the new books that started to become available on the subject of gardens and parks since the Second World-War. For example essays or books on iconic Landscape Architects such as Christopher Tunnard (Neckar, 1993) and Sir Geoffrey Jellicoe (Spens, 1994) (Fig. 1) became available and the Landscape Institute (1994) published its guide to Twentieth Century British landscape design. The Landscape Design Trust (2008) started a series of monographs on eminent landscape designers such as Sir Geoffrey Jellicoe (Harvey, 1998), Dame Sylvia Crowe (Collens and Powell (eds.), 1999) and Peter Shepheard (Downs, 2004). Jane Brown (2000) (Fig. 2) and Janet Waymark (2003b) both put modern garden design in the spotlight and even the Garden History Society picked up on the theme in its journal (Woudstra and Ratti, 2000). Publications from the United States also raised awareness such as books by Spacemaker Press on renowned designers such as Hideo Sasaki (Simo and Dillon 1997) and Peter Walker (Levy and Walker, 1997). Other books focused on iconic landscapes such as the Miller Garden, designed by Dan Kiley (Hildebrand, 1999). Garden design magazines, radio and television programmes, and gardening shows all appeared to have contributed to the establishment of landscape design as a recognised field.
In strong contrast, iconic sites remained condemned, endangered, and at times demolished. For example Gibberd’s Water Gardens in Harlow New Town received much attention as they were dismantled and relocated (Twentieth Century Society,
2002) (Fig. 3), this, even though the site featured on English Heritage’s Register of Historic Gardens and Parks of Interest in England (Rutherford, 2000) and against the opposition of many conservation agencies or charities (Harwood, 1997). Similar cases of damaged or destroyed sites can be found internationally and have featured in many publications or websites. The Cultural Landscape Foundation (2008h) lists several cases online under ‘Landslides - Landscapes at Risk’. Others argued at specialist conferences against the destruction of modern landscape architecture as can be seen in Fig. 4. (Komara, 2004). The present situation was summed up by Richard Longstreth (2004) by saying that ‘…landscapes of the recent past are, too often, the last considered and the most threatened. As nearly the last things we have done, they are often the first things we believe must be done again….’.

Fig. 3: Harlow Water Gardens at risk in 2002 (Twentieth Century Society, 2002).

Being actively involved in the heritage sector and conservation of designed landscapes the present situation alerted me and gave reason for several questions. The first important question was how is it possible that iconic sites which are, based on an assessment of significance, placed on a national register can still be so easily disfigured or destroyed. This surely indicates a serious problem in the policy framework. If registered sites are not even safe, what then is the fate of all non-
registered sites? It appears that we do not know how many significant sites exist or which ones are at risk. There is a general lack of understanding about the key problems that currently exist with the protection and conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past. We clearly do not seem to know the conservation status of these landscapes and what actions or measures should be taken to improve the situation in desired areas. The present situation shows that the knowledge and data on the subject is lacking, fragmented, scattered, and incomplete. In other words, we do not appreciate what the main issues for the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past are and who should take up the necessary roles and responsibilities for their conservation.

Fig. 4: Charles Birnbaum and the Cultural Landscape Foundation have been campaigning against the destruction of modernist masterpieces, such as the NCNB Plaza in Tampa, Florida, designed by Dan Kiley and completed in 1988 (Birnbaum, 2003c).
1.2 Research proposition

Developing and enhancing the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past is impossible without a comprehensive understanding of the present situation and the key concerns.

1.3 Research objectives

For those reasons the research aim is to bring the scattered understanding about the present situation and the key problems together and develop a more coherent and comprehensive approach. Research objectives are:

1. Investigate the present protection of designed landscapes of the recent past in the United Kingdom.
2. Investigate roles and initiatives undertaken by key stakeholders in the conservation process of designed landscapes of the recent past.
3. Investigate key problems and concerns with the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past.
4. Investigate the impact of the lack of a comprehensive approach and understanding.
5. Based on the findings, recommend key areas for measures and action to enhance the conservation and protection of designed landscapes of the recent past.

It is hoped that findings from the study will inform and facilitate progress with the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past in the United Kingdom.

1.4 Organisation of the thesis

The remainder of the thesis is organised as follows. Charts, tables and figures have been used throughout the thesis to assist with visual presentation of results and to illustrate findings.

Chapter Two, the theoretical framework and literature review, examines key initiatives, existing action and research. It critically reviews current knowledge and forms the basis for the gaps identified to which the study hopes to contribute. It brings the reader up to date with current literature on the subject and introduces the main focus of this
This confirms that some recommendations for ways to improve conservation of heritage from the recent past exist, including suggestions for conserving designed landscapes. The main existing recommendations will be clarified in a chronology order. This informs us that progress has been made with the protection of these landscapes but that much work still needs to be done in order to arrive at satisfactory and efficient conservation practice. This review will result in an overview of the main areas of existing recommendations for action against which in the next chapters progress made will be cross-examined.

In Chapter Three key terminology is defined to set the scope of the study. A typology for designed landscapes is agreed after which the meaning behind the recent past within the context of this study is clarified. Given the scope of the research, conservation and the conservation process are interpreted. This leads to the preparation of an overview of categories of stakeholders, or organisations and people that are involved in the conservation process of designed landscapes. These categories set the framework under which the initiatives of stakeholders is assessed in later chapters.

Chapter Four presents the research methodology, which is the between-method triangulation research methodology, as it combines two methods of investigation, namely data triangulation and theory triangulation. From the exploratory literature review in Chapter Two and the categories of main stakeholders, it became evident that combining methods is required to explore the key research question from the wider perspective or ‘the general’, and the site-specific context or ‘the particular’:

- Through the additional investigation into published sources and records, such as the inventories of historic landscapes, the wider context or ‘the general’ can be studied in further detail, with a validation and cross-examination of the findings of the literature review. This method is a form of theory triangulation.
- In the case study survey, a type of data triangulation, questionnaires and interviews are used, to enable the collection and analysis of data from different categories of stakeholders from a site-specific perspective or ‘the particular’ context. The case study survey data will be cross-examined with other findings.

Chapter Four also presents the outcome of the case study survey in regard to yielding relevant samples from the targeted respondents groups by using the snowballing
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technique. Here the main themes and categories of problems that prevail in the case studies are established together with the number of responses. Experiences during fieldwork are documented to assist in interpreting the outcomes.

Chapter Five evaluates the continuing destruction and disfigurement of significant sites and shows that while policy frameworks and conservation philosophies are in place to facilitate the protection of significant heritage serious threats to sites remain. Ongoing impacts and threats are illustrated under physical neglect and poor maintenance of sites, disfigurement of sites and destruction of sites.

Chapter Six evaluates the current status of inventories and registers and examines what roles official inventories and registers play at present in providing protection and understanding of existing sites and their significance.

Chapter Seven examines the role and work of key stakeholders at an international and national level. The emphasis of the study is on activities in the United Kingdom but important lessons can be learned from the international context. The analysis provides an overview of progress achieved by key stakeholders, highlights remaining gaps and validates the findings of Chapter Two.

In Chapter Eight the site-specific context is explored through the use of the case study survey. It was concluded that existing literature and research sources do not provide sufficient information from the perspective of the stakeholder categories of people closely involved in the day to day management of sites, the wider public and visitors. To address this fundamental gap in understanding it was decided to use field surveys under a case study method. The case study method allows for the collection of new primary data and information through questionnaires and interviews and in-depth examination and analysis of the data.

Chapter Eight presents the analysis of the main concerns and problems that were raised by respondents. The results are analysed under ten main categories:

A. Awareness and recognition
B. Concerns about the management and maintenance of sites
C. Concerns about finance and budgets
D. Challenges associated with materials and design
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E. Shortcomings in conservation planning and development processes
F. Challenges with consulting and involving people
G. Concerns about legal protection and politics
H. Concerns about social problems and vandalism
I. Concerns about marketing and commercialisation
J. Concerns about education, enjoyment, interpretation and access

This was done for ease of interpretation and to facilitate empirical validation of the theoretical analysis in the literature review chapters. Under the first category, lack of awareness and recognition, Chapter Eight also elaborates the key findings from the case study survey on the subject of people’s opinions about landscapes of the recent past, the reasons for poor recognition and the threat this poses to landscapes of the recent past. This leads to a comprehensive overview of key concerns and problems and better understanding of the present situation.

Chapter Nine cross-examines the findings from previous chapters. This review will highlight the urgent need for better protection, increased recognition and improved conservation treatments of designed landscapes of the recent past. Limitations of the research will be given as will areas for further research. In the conclusions the study recommends key areas for measures and action which are specific to the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past and gives guidance and recommendations for stakeholders to facilitate the implementation of the required actions.
CHAPTER TWO

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The aim of the research is to assess the current protection of designed landscapes of the recent past and to identify key problems, gaps or shortcomings in their conservation. To assist with this the theoretical framework and literature review chapter dwells on the policy framework and existing recommendations for the protection of landscapes of the recent past. Key initiatives and existing recommendations and research conclusions on the subject were analysed. This will place the study within a context and give an indication of the contribution of this study to existing knowledge.

From the literature review it became clear that several recommendations to improve the conservation of heritage from the recent past, including designed landscapes, already have been voiced. As this is of key importance to the research a table with a comparison and chronological overview of the main recommendations has been included in Table 2.1 in Appendix 1.

The recommendations are listed in this table under several thematic headings to facilitate comparison and assist in identifying gaps and shortcomings in current approaches. The literature review follows a chronological sequence and will refer to the recommendations where necessary. As explained in the introduction chapter, the aim of the study is to understand the key problems and progress in the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, work done in other countries will also be taken into account where appropriate.

2.2 A gradual change of attitude to the recent past

It was in the early 1980s that a gradual change of attitude to heritage from the post war period was noticeable (Luxen, 1995). Literature shows that in the 1980s in the United
Kingdom it was becoming evident that many fine post-war sites were under threat. For example, the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) had organised its first seminar on Twentieth Century heritage in Paris (Luxen, 1995) and amenity societies were starting to press for changes in legislation in the United Kingdom to allow post-war sites to be listed (Twentieth Century Society, 2008a) using the argument that ‘…history does not stop…’ (Powers, 2008). An important outcome was that in April 1987 English Heritage started to use a ‘thirty-year rolling rule’ for its listing programme (Page, 1992) this instead of confining listing to 1940, which was the case up to 1987. A similar approach already existed in Scotland (Twentieth Century Society, 2008a) and the rule would also be applied to the Register of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest (English Heritage, 1993). In addition threatened buildings of outstanding quality and at least ten years old could now also be listed under exceptional circumstances (Page, 1992). Clarifying English Heritage’s new approach, Diane Chablo (1988) explained that architecture is often most at risk when a period of architecture is out of fashion. She also wrote about the problems with the use of inexpensive and experimental techniques in post-war buildings, but that despite this certain buildings are such important examples of this period that they must be preserved.

In comparison it must be noted that in the United States similar approaches were already in place for about eight years where a fifty-year rolling rule had been used since 1979 for the National Register together with special guidelines for evaluating and nominating properties that achieved significance within the past fifty years (Sherfy and Luce, 1998).

In the late 1980s more authors started to raise the issue of protection of heritage from the recent past and were putting forward recommendations to improve the situation (Benjamin, 1988; Chablo, 1988). Speaking about improving the conservation of recent landmarks Susan Benjamin (1988) said that ‘…there are no easy answers…..’ but also highlighted what he saw as three areas for possible action: to promote conservation programmes that focus on the theme; to encourage articles, books, and lectures on the topic; and landmarking, meaning listing sites. What later turned out to become a major step forward was the founding of the International Working Party for Documentation and Conservation of Buildings Sites and Neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement (DOCOMOMO International) (2007b) in 1988 and the preparation by DOCOMOMO

In the Eindhoven Statement DOCOMOMO sets out its main mission under six themes:

1. Bring the significance of the modern movement to the attention of the public, the authorities, the professions and the educational community concerned with the built environment.
2. Identify and promote recording of works of the modern movement, including a register, drawings, photographs, archives and other documents.
3. Foster the development of appropriate techniques and methods of conservation and disseminate this knowledge throughout the professions.
4. Oppose destruction and disfigurement of significant works of the modern movement.
5. Identify and attract funding for documentation and conservation.
6. Explore and develop the knowledge of the modern movement.

Promotion, protection and effective conservation management echoed Benjamin’s (1988) three key recommendations but DOCOMOMO did go further in its suggestions for action. DOCOMOMO added the themes of identification, the development of techniques and methods, retaining archives, and the issue of funding. It was particularly surprising that others had not yet raised funding more frequently but an underlying reason for this is that funding in theory will underpin any action. An initial conclusion from these first calls for action is that the main focus was on the promotion, documentation and registration of heritage from the recent past. With still limited documentation available on the subject these recommendations therefore reflected the need to establish a better baseline understanding and availability of reference documentation.

Around the same time of the creation of DOCOMOMO the Council of Europe organised its first colloquy on Twentieth Century architectural heritage in Vienna in 1989 (Council of Europe, 1994). This is an indication that there was also a growing realisation at European level that it was high time to recognise the contribution made by Twentieth Century movements. The colloquy culminated in the Council’s Recommendation on the Protection of the Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage (Council of Europe, 1991). It listed detailed principles for the conservation and enhancement of the architectural heritage of the Twentieth Century. The recommendations were grouped under five main headings (Council of Europe, 1991):
• Identification of the Twentieth Century heritage: Including the promotion of knowledge, the study of this heritage and making systematic inventories

• Protection of the most significant heritage items: By developing criteria for selection and taking practical measures for legal protection.

• Management and conservation of the heritage: By proper use of the heritage and its physical conservation, and the training of specialists.

• Promotion of awareness among persons in positions of responsibility and among the public: Through encouraging programmes of education, and the use of publicity, and publications.

• The necessity for future European cooperation: Through exchange of experts, understanding and experience, a coordination of effort, generate awareness, and multilateral conservation projects.

The Council of Europe’s recommendations reiterated most of the already mentioned recommendations but did not include the need to enhance understanding about techniques, methods and materials, despite it having been recommended before by others. The recommendation of the Council of Europe was however the first important recommendation on the subject that emphasised the need for training and education, and international cooperation.

It took until 1994 for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to launch action on the subject. This occurred when they acknowledged that a Global Strategy for a credible, balanced and more representative World Heritage List was required (UNESCO, 1994). A balanced list also meant that there was a need to include heritage of the recent past and as a result the UNESCO World Heritage Committee instructed ICOMOS to prepare a report on the subject (Luxen, 1995). ICOMOS response was to convene experts in Helsinki who consequently prepared and agreed the ICOMOS General Recommendations on the Protection of Twentieth Century Heritage (ICOMOS, 1995). A comparison with the previously mentioned suggestions for actions tells us that the recommendations basically added more weight to the existing proposals. In particular partnership cooperation is mentioned as being essential, as well as identification, research programmes and inventories. A recommendation by ICOMOS that had not yet been stated as such, was that ‘…attention is required to all types and even modest examples of such heritage…’ and that ‘…attention should be paid to the full spectrum
of the heritage...’ of the Twentieth Century (ICOMOS, 1995). ICOMOS elaborates this further by saying that the actions should not only address heritage of the recent past but also should relate to the use of new technologies as well as traditional materials (ICOMOS, 1995). An important conclusion that ICOMOS included was that ‘...the established principles of conservation are a valid basis for the safeguarding and care of the recent heritage....’ (ICOMOS, 1995). This is significant because when dealing with new types of heritage an initial response from those involved could include the belief that completely new conservation methodologies are required. ICOMOS points out that this is not the case and the general principles of conservation apply to any type of heritage and should be adhered to wherever possible. Many of the existing conservation charters and principles were prepared by ICOMOS so it is no surprise that ICOMOS highlights this. Under raising awareness ICOMOS also mentions the role media can play, with this it also enforced the message of the need for the enhancement of education and training (ICOMOS, 1995). With these frameworks in place initial programmes for the identification of sites for inclusion on the World Heritage List (Bandarin, 2003) were developed by ICOMOS and DOCOMOMO. It is important to note that as at May 2003 still only twelve properties on the World Heritage List represented Modern Heritage (UNESCO, 2003).

Within this context of increasing awareness of the values of post war heritage or the ‘...change of heart...’ (Saint, 1992a) towards recent heritage, English Heritage had also started to communicate its new approach (Saint, 1992b) and set up more initiatives. They organised an exhibition on ‘The Age of Optimism: Post-war Architecture in England 1945-70’ (Saint, 1994) (Fig. 5), published in 1996 brochures on ‘Something Worth Keeping? Post War Architecture in England’ (Harwood, 1996) (Fig. 6), and strengthened ties with architectural pressure groups such as DOCOMOMO and the Twentieth Century Society (Harwood, 1996). In the United States similar activities were starting to happen with a key event being the first ‘Preserving the Recent Past Conference’ in Chicago (Slaton et al., 1995), ran by the National Park Service together with the Preservation Education Foundation and the Association for Preservation Technology International.
Fig. 5: The English Heritage exhibition on ‘The Age of Optimism: Post-war Architecture in England 1945-70’ with on the poster cover the Leicester University Engineering Building by Stirling and Gowan (1953-63) and the Elephant and Rhinoceros Pavilion at London Zoo, by Casson, Condor and Partners (1962-65) (Saint, 1994).

Fig. 6: Cover of the English Heritage brochure of 1996 on ‘Something Worth Keeping? Post War Architecture in England’. Illustrating the Severn Bridge, Avon, by Freeman, Fox and Partners (1961-66), the Epidauros, St Ives, Cornwall, by Barbara Hepworth (1961), and Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, City of London, by Chamberlain, Powell and Bon (1958-61) (Harwood, 1996).

A conclusion is that by 1995 a whole series of initiatives had been undertaken with an emphasis on post war architecture, but that none of these activities and resources had
a special focus on landscapes. For example at the conferences only sporadically lectures on landscapes from the recent past featured.

2.3 Initial initiatives on landscapes of the recent past from 1995

It took until the 1990s for the first significant literature and initiatives on the subject of landscapes of the recent past to emerge. For these first significant initiatives we even have to look outside the United Kingdom. In 1995 several activities took place in the United States on landscape architecture of the recent past, including the first specific recommendations. This occurred at the ‘Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture Conference’ in Wave Hill, New York (Birnbaum, 1999b) (Fig. 7) were conservation specialists and designers gathered (Walker, 1999) and Charles Birnbaum (1999b) proposed first overarching recommendations for improvements in the protection of modern landscapes. Birnbaum (1999a) gives nine overarching suggestions for actions, many of which mirror the recommendations mentioned but Birnbaum raised some suggestions which so far had received limited attention. This includes the need for consultation, in particular with the original designers, at least where still possible.

Two other points that Birnbaum includes and that had not yet been highlighted are that measures should be taken to ensure proper homes for archives, and that countries must formulate a national strategy. To formulate a national strategy Birnbaum urges that the American Society of Landscape Architects and the Landscape Architecture Foundation ‘…should develop a strategy to safeguard this legacy through a special committee of recognised landscape historians and scholars…’ (Birnbaum, 1999a). Birnbaum mentions the need for nominations and inventories for recent landscape architecture and the urgency to document threatened work by giving suggestions towards the ‘…possibilities for the documentation, evaluation, and preservation of this recent, yet important legacy….’ (Birnbaum, 1999a).

When speaking about the need to establish a larger context for contemporary landscape architecture, Birnbaum highlights the need for more understanding about the wider context, and not just individual sites (Birnbaum, 1999a). Birnbaum also speaks about the need to educate and establish creative partnerships. While Birnbaum’s recommendations are written with modern landscape architecture in mind it is of interest to read them with landscape architecture of the recent past in mind and a
non-United States context. His philosophy that we must utilise current standards and guidelines when embarking on project work reflects the ICOMOS recommendation to use the established principles of conservation (ICOMOS, 1995).


In the epilogue to the proceedings of the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture Conference Richard Haag (1999), one of the leading American landscape architects of the recent past, also recommends fifteen techniques for the conservation of contemporary landscape architecture. His recommendations differ in that they suggest for action specifically from the perspective of the landscape architects. Haag gives examples of how landscape architects can pro-actively make contributions. These more inward looking and disciplinary suggestions are significant because one shortcoming of many recommendations is that they look mainly at the overarching international and national context, and less at the more disciplinary, local or site specific issues. In doing so it is not always clear what each individual can do to contribute to conservation of these sites, rather than governments and organisations.
Some of the suggestions by Haag include that landscape architects should proclaim pride of authorship and put their own work out there to be judged. Another suggestions is to befriend the groundskeeper and to put records such as plans and statements of intent in archives. Haag also proposes to use matters relating to taxation and legislation to protect modern landscapes. Important is his requests to the American Society of Landscape Architects to review and strengthen its policies and to set up an arm of its organisation that would take a closer interest in the preservation of contemporary landscapes (Haag, 1999). The main point to keep in mind from Haag’s suggestions is that the overarching international and national recommendations leave a gap in regard of what could be done at local and site specific level.

Some other international landscape initiatives around the mid-1990s occurred within the context of DOCOMOMO. While the occasional paper on landscapes was delivered at the DOCOMOMO bi-annual international conferences, it was at the conference in Barcelona in 1994 (DOCOMOMO Spain, 1995) that discussions lead to the founding of an International Specialist Committee on Gardens and Landscapes (Panzini, 1996). The Committee later became the Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscapes (De Jonge et al., 2002).

In the United Kingdom, very little efforts were noted in the mid 1990s on the subject of the protection of recent landscapes. In 1997 the English Heritage Post-War Listing Steering Group for buildings suggested that they would be available to liaise with the Gardens Register Team at English Heritage on designations of post war gardens and landscapes (Harwood, 1997). Dr Alan Powers, a member of the Steering Group and involved in the Twentieth Century Society developed together with the Garden History Society (Harwood, 1997) the idea for a first Twentieth Century conference on the theory of post war gardens and landscapes. This two day conference took place in March 1998 at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, and was attended by about 200 delegates. It was the first ever such event in the United Kingdom (Garden History Society, 2008c) and a series of papers were published in 2000 in the Garden History Journal (Woudstra and Ratti, 2000) (Fig. 8). In general, few initiatives had occurred in the United Kingdom on the subject up to 2000 and those that took place also appeared to have focused on establishing a reference framework with baseline documentation to inform the listing of landscapes of recent times.
2.4 Emphasis on material and technological challenges of buildings of the recent past

In the same period from 1995 to 2000 several authors and events had started to address the building related questions about the material and technological challenges of recent past heritage. First significant work in the early 1990s progressed in the United States where the National Park Service published by 1993 a special themed journal on the recent past (Shiffer, 1993b). The National Park Service had started to explore the material questions as part of an initiative to prepare a Twentieth Century building products database (Jester, 1993). This work lead in 1995 to the publication of a book by Thomas Jester of the National Park Service that was seen as ‘...the first in-depth survey of important construction materials used since 1900...’ (Jester, 1995). At the Preserving the Recent Past conference in 1995 in the United States, Shiffer reiterated the importance of the need for promotion, documentation, protection, forging partnerships and the sharing of knowledge and results (Slaton et al., 1995). While the
Council of Europe had not specified the issue of technology, by the mid-1990s more attention was being given towards the essential need for improved understanding of materials and technologies. Shiffer commented that ‘...to meet this challenge, we need to build upon what we know and reach further....’ (Shiffer, 1995). One of Shiffer’s concerns that related to our knowledge of materials and techniques was that we must attempt more conservation treatments rather than opting for the removal of such heritage. Shiffer (1995) felt that ‘...as in any new field, our understanding and appreciation of the significance of the resources has advanced further than our knowledge about how to maintain and conserve them....’. Bruce Kriviskey (1995) also spoke at the Preserving the Recent Past conference in 1995 about his ideas towards approaching the conservation of heritage from the recent past. He commented similarly that identification, recording, communication, and the actual conservation of sites are vitally important and supported Shiffer’s argument that one of our biggest challenges was dealing with the technical issues. This also reiterated that there is a need for more awareness about heritage of the recent past but that a major challenge is the fact that heritage from the recent past is still perceived as not sufficiently old enough to be listed (Kriviskey, 1995).

A follow-up conference on the Preserving the Recent Past Conference was organised in 2000 (Slaton and Foulks, 2000b), while English Heritage held a ‘Modern Matters’ (English Heritage, 1995) and ‘Preserving post-war heritage’ (English Heritage, 1998a) conference around the same time and with similar themes and material questions being addressed. Both the 1995 (Macdonald, 1996a) and 1998 (Macdonald, 2001) conferences resulted in publications by Susan Macdonald that assisted in raising awareness and sharing expertise. The work by DOCOMOMO also made a major contribution to the challenges of new technologies. Their bi-annual conferences were excellent platforms for sharing expertise and also special technology dossiers were published (DOCOMOMO International, 1997b). Again most of these initiatives focussed on architectural challenges and were not developed from a designed landscapes perspective.
2.5 International initiatives on landscapes of the recent past from 2000

In 2000 again a period of heightened activity commenced with the above mentioned follow-up conference on Preserving the Recent Past (Slaton and Foulks, 2000b) and the preparation of the ICOMOS Montreal Action Plan in 2001 (Bumbaru, 2001). The second Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture Conference also took place in 2002 (Birnbaum et al., 2004) with requests for action being reiterated (Fig. 9). Key areas for action still included the identification of significant structures, their documentation and evaluation, the understanding of their aesthetics and technology, and the development of methods for their repair and conservation (Slaton and Foulks, 2000b). The Council of Europe had already launched in 1995 its ‘Recommendation on the integrated conservation of cultural landscape areas as part of landscape policies’ (Council of Europe, 1995a), but it was their European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000) that created the momentum.

Fig. 9: Proceedings of the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture Conference II, 2002, on the theme of Making Postwar Landscapes Visible, showing the Miller Garden, Columbus, Indiana, designed by Dan Kiley in 1955 (Birnbaum et al., 2004).
State parties sign up to the Convention’s five specific measures which mirror many of the other recommendations including awareness raising, training and education, identification and assessment, landscape quality objectives, and implementation. Together with the recommendations that came out of the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture, the European Landscape Convention is the only document that also underlines the importance of public participation in the conservation process. Most importantly the European Landscape Convention specifically states that it does not just apply to remarkable landscapes but also to ‘…ordinary everyday landscapes and blighted areas…’ (Council of Europe, 2000), and therefore also to those of the recent past. This is also one of the key messages of the Montreal Action Plan on Twentieth Century Heritage, as prepared by Dinu Bumbaru (2001) after the ICOMOS meeting in Montreal. This was mainly in response to the need for a more balanced UNESCO World Heritage List and the desire to include more Twentieth Century heritage. The Montreal Action Plan calls for an understanding of the full diversity of Twentieth Century heritage and all of the issues related to its recognition and conservation, and a promotion of this heritage (Bumbaru, 2001).

The 2002 follow-up conference on the Preservation of Modern Landscape Architecture resulted in the Wave Hill Charter (Fig. 10), the first charter on the Preservation of Modern Landscape Architecture (Birnbaum et al., 2004). The charter is very brief and specifically applicable to the United States, but nevertheless remains of importance as it is to date still the only specific charter on landscape architecture of this period. The charter was signed by delegates of the conference who made a general plea to the American Society of Landscape Architects (2008) to develop ‘…national guidance and ethics regarding the ongoing preservation and management of national significant works of landscape architecture from the recent past…’ (Birnbaum et al., 2004), before it is too late, and to avoid seminal works from this period being destroyed. An important fact is that it is one of the only recommendations that highlights that informed decision making should involve public discourse (Birnbaum et al., 2004).

It is clear that so many activities were taking place in the United States around this time, but it is also important to illustrate that much more action was wished for, and this is confirmed by the formation of the Recent Past Preservation Network (2008c) in 2000, which however has primarily a buildings focus. More significant for the landscape context was that in the wake of the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture
conferences Birnbaum also took in 1998 the initiative to set up the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2008h) in the United States. This not-for-profit foundation also takes a special interest in the conservation of landscapes of the recent past and appears to be to date the only independent organisation that takes such a pro-active interest in the conservation of designed landscapes.

Fig. 10: The Wave Hill Charter 2002 (Birnbaum et al., 2004).

2.6 Increased focus on landscapes of the recent past in the United Kingdom from 2000

The proposed relocation of Gibberd’s Water Gardens at Harlow New Town in 2001 became a watershed in the United Kingdom in its recognition of the importance of conservation of landscapes of the recent past (English Heritage, 2007a). The Water Gardens were listed as Grade II* or of ‘exceptional historic interest’ by English Heritage (Rutherford, 2000). This is against the background of English Heritage having in 1997 strongly opposed to the proposals for relocation of the gardens for retail development.
(Duterloo, 1997) and having spoken about grave concerns (Harwood, 1997). Together with the Twentieth Century Society (2002), the Garden History Society (Lambert, 1997) and the late Lady Gibberd (Rouse, 2001), English Heritage voiced its opposition, but planning consent by Harlow Council (Shingler, 2001) to Wilson Bowden Development Limited nevertheless was approved. The site got relocated (Fig. 11 and Fig. 12) and as a consequence de-listed by English Heritage (Conway, 2003). The case of the Water Gardens is not unique and many other examples of damaged or demolished sites can be found internationally and have featured in publications. For example, the Cultural Landscape Foundation’s (2008h) online initiative ‘Landslides - Landscapes at Risk’ illustrates several cases, while the destruction of the Denver Skyline Park was the subject of Komara’s paper at the DOCOMOMO New York conference (Komara, 2004).

In the United Kingdom the case of the Water Gardens contributed to increased attention paid by several organisations to the subject. The case for example meant that the theme stayed for a couple of years on English Heritage agendas (English Heritage, 2007a), with a post-1945 landscapes typology (Duterloo-Morgan, 2002a) and some theme studies being developed (English Heritage, 2003a). The DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group (DOCOMOMO International, 2007a) explored ideas for the establishment of a more specific Urban Register (Haenraets, 2003) with an aim to find more efficient ways to include urban areas, as well as their landscaping components in registers. The Garden History Society (2003a) launched an online collaborative research effort on post war Gardens (Fig. 13) and the Landscape Design Trust (2008) started to publish a series of monographs on eminent practitioners in landscape architecture. In general more publications on landscape design from the recent past came out but most of these still looked at iconic sites and designers, rather than at the conservation of such sites.
Fig. 11: Sir Frederick Gibberd’s Water Gardens in Harlow New Town before their relocation (Gibberd Garden Trust, 2004).

Fig. 12: Sir Frederick Gibberd’s Water Gardens at Harlow New Town in 2006 after relocation for retail development (Author’s photograph).
2.7 The momentum stagnates

Birnbaum (2003b) pointed out that while in 2001 the interest in, and awareness of modern landscape architecture and its preservation appeared to have increased dramatically since 1995, there remained much work to do. In the United Kingdom, Powers (2008) concluded that after that the initial approach to listing was ‘…a rather ill-considered flash in the pan….’. It was felt that from 1992 to 2002 good progress was made by English Heritage towards listing of building from the recent past. The disbanding of the Post War Listing Steering Group in 2002 (Powers, 2008) caused though a feeling as if from than on ‘…things have stood still or gone backwards….’ and that the government has not committed itself sufficiently to this subject (Powers, 2008). Important is also that by 2003 still only fourteen of the 1450 sites on English Heritage’s...
Register of Parks and Gardens were post war sites (English Heritage, 2003b), with Gibberd's Water Gardens being de-listed (Conway, 2003).

In the meantime key organisations continue to raise occasionally their concerns. A recent recommendation that should be mentioned here is the Moscow Declaration on the Preservation of Twentieth Century Cultural Heritage, prepared by ICOMOS (ICOMOS Russia, 2006). The Moscow Declaration has a whole list of what is seen as necessary actions, many of which reflect the suggestions of earlier recommendations. What stands out is that it is one of only two documents that highlight the provision of funding, and its recommendation to improve collecting and treatment of documents is also a subject which has overall received limited focus in the other documents. Interesting to note is that since the mid-1990s the need for compiling registers and the use of established guidelines did not get much mentioned in recommendations, until again in the Moscow Declaration (ICOMOS Russia, 2006). The areas that the declaration appears to overlook are training and education, consultation and participation, technology and methods.

2.8 Conclusions

The comparison and analysis of the existing recommendations made it clear that in the past twenty years many people and organisations have highlighted similar suggestions for needed action. From the analysis it became clear that these recommendations for areas of action can be grouped under thirteen main headings or areas for actions. An overview of a comparison of these recommendations can be found in Table 2.1 in Appendix 1.

The thirteen main headings are:

A. Survey, analysis and evaluation of sites
B. Legal protection and listing
C. Management and maintenance programmes of sites
D. Promotion, raising awareness and communication
E. Understanding technological and material challenges
F. Understanding the wider context of landscape architecture of the recent past
G. Use of established methods and principles
H. Cooperation and partnerships
I. Development of national strategies
J. Monitor and record keeping
K. Consultation and participation
L. Training and education
M. Funding

It is clear that much progress was made over the past years in some of these areas with several initiatives taken forward by diverse actors. Nevertheless there remain serious shortcomings and many ongoing efforts are still required, as has been pointed out by some campaigners (Birnbaum, 1999a). To understand more clearly where existing action comes short and what additional initiatives are required, further research must be undertaken. How this study will contribute to a wider understanding of these issues will be explained in the research methodology.
CHAPTER THREE

3 CONSERVATION AND DESIGNED LANDSCAPES OF THE RECENT PAST

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter key terminology is defined and explained within the context of the study. For this purpose designed landscapes will first be defined, after which the meaning behind the recent past within the context of this study will be explored. This allows the preparation of an overview of categories of designed landscapes of the recent past. Given the scope of the research the definitions of conservation and the conservation process will also be clarified. The main categories of stakeholders, or organisations and people that are involved in the conservation process of designed landscapes will also be explored as these categories will be a useful framework under which the activities of all stakeholders can in the next chapters be assessed.

3.2 Defining designed landscapes

To study the problems associated with the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past, it is essential to explain what is meant by designed landscapes in the context of this study. To do this we must look at some existing definitions. UNESCO describes the category of designed landscapes as embracing ‘…garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles…..’ (UNESCO, 2008f). In the United States the National Park Service (Birnbaum, 2001) and the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2003a) use a similar definition for Historic Designed Landscape:

‘A landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect, or horticulturist according to design principles, or an amateur gardener working in a recognized style or tradition. The landscape may be associated with a significant person(s), trend, or event in
Historic Scotland (2008e) points out how such landscapes can illustrate unique artistic talent, or host rare plant collections, which reflect social and economic change. The Florence Charter on Gardens highlights that topography, structural and decorative features, and water is used to achieve architectural compositions (ICOMOS-IFLA, 1982). Similarly vegetation is used, including its choice of species, proportions, colour schemes, spacing and respective heights. Designed landscapes will incorporate all elements (hard landscaping and soft landscaping using flowers, fruit, vegetables, trees and shrubs, wildlife, woodlands, build structures, countryside, farmland, and so on) to create a beautiful prospect and for public resort.

The range of designed landscapes is vast and includes gardens, parks, arboreta, campuses, institutional grounds, cemeteries, urban squares, car parks, and estates, ranging from small to large sites, designed in more formal or naturalistic or landscape fashions. Main categories of designed landscapes of the recent past will be further described later.

Historic Scotland (2008e) compiles the Inventory of Designed Landscapes in Scotland and specifically refers to designed landscapes and not historic designed landscapes as the Inventory can include landscapes from any time period. The use of the term designed landscapes in this study's title must be interpreted in a similar way.

### 3.2.1 Landscape characteristics

The physical appearance of gardens and designed landscapes is determined by tangible and intangible elements of widely different characters. These character-defining features and components can contribute individually or collectively to the site and are evidence of how it evolved over time. These features will fall under three groups: unchanging components, the physical environment, and living things (National Trust for Scotland, 2003a). Such features or landscape characteristics include vegetation, soil, archaeology, wildlife, water systems, circulation, furnishings, buildings and structures. In addition elements such as views and vistas, setting, land use, and
topography are important features. Through architectural composition and landscape elements are used to achieve the desired effect for a site.

### 3.2.2 Setting and surroundings

A designed landscape cannot be isolated from its setting and surroundings (ICOMOS-IFLA, 1982), and together with the physical location of its elements they are an integral part of the significance of a site. The conservation and management of change of designed landscapes must therefore take into account and protect its visual setting and connections, and the ecological balance must be protected by avoiding inappropriate changes to the site’s environment.

### 3.3 Cultural landscapes

To understand what is meant with ‘designed landscapes’ it is also essential to define how the research will interpret ‘landscape’. A definition for ‘landscape’ can be found in the European Landscape Convention by the Council of Europe (2000), which is used within the context of landscape conservation. The European Landscape Convention describes landscape as:

> ‘An area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors’ (Council of Europe, 2000).

This definition makes clear that landscape is about the relationship between people and place. Landscape is an expression people use to define their experience and perception of the combination of topography, water, vegetation cover and the cultural environment. The values of landscape include historical, aesthetic and spiritual associations as well as physical attributes and processes (National Trust for Scotland, 2005a). Landscape is made up of two main components: natural heritage and cultural heritage. Aspects of natural heritage interests include geological and biological features; biodiversity; some natural aspects of landscape; scientific and research values. Historic cultural heritage aspects of a landscape include archaeology, buildings, collections, designed landscapes, gardens, industrial archaeology, scientific and research values, places associated with historic events, people, myths or folklore (National Trust for Scotland, 2003a).
The definition of ‘landscape’ in the European Landscape Convention is basically one for ‘cultural landscapes’ (Walshe, 2006). It is generally accepted that about every landscape in Europe has undergone cultural influences and therefore about all landscapes in Europe are cultural landscapes. The degree of natural heritage and cultural heritage in landscapes just varies greatly across landscapes. As a result the word ‘cultural’ got dropped and the European Landscape Convention uses ‘landscape’ when referring in theory to ‘cultural landscapes’.

This is confirmed by other international definitions for cultural landscapes. In the Operational Guidelines of UNESCO’s Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage the term cultural landscape is described as embracing ‘…a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment...’ (UNESCO, 2008f), which echoes the definition of the European Landscape Foundation. The full definition for cultural landscapes used by UNESCO is:

‘Cultural landscapes are cultural properties and represent the "combined works of nature and of man" designated in Article 1 of the Convention. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal’ (UNESCO, 2008f).

The definition that the United States National Park Service uses for cultural landscapes further confirms the international agreement over this term:

‘A geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values’ (Birnbaum, 1999c).

When comparing the National Park Service guidance on cultural landscapes (Page et al., 1998), the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000), the Operational Guidelines by UNESCO (2008f), and the definitions by the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2003a), than it becomes clear that there is much similarity in the categories of cultural landscapes that are used.
The National Park Service (Birnbaum, 2001) and the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2003a) use four main groups of cultural landscapes, with the understanding that there is an overlap across these groups. The four groups are:

1. Historic Site
2. Historic Vernacular Landscapes
3. Ethnographic Landscapes
4. Historic designed landscapes

UNESCO’s Operational Guidelines (UNESCO, 2008f) make use of three main categories of cultural landscapes:

- Landscapes designed and created intentionally by man.
- Organically evolved landscapes: Including relict (fossil) landscapes and continuing landscapes
- Associative cultural landscapes

Even though there are variations in the categories used by organisations, each use the category of designed landscapes.

**3.4 Defining the recent past**

The Oxford English Dictionary describes ‘recent’ as ‘having happened or been done lately; belonging to a period of time not long ago’ (Soanes and Hawker, 2005). This research therefore looks at designed landscapes that were created not long ago. The question however remains what ‘not long ago’ means, as depending on what someone specifically studies, ‘long ago’ can be interpreted very differently.

The use of the term ‘recent past’ in this study was based on current use of the terminology in the conservation field. For example the Recent Past Preservation Network (2008c), an organisation in the United States which is active within this subject, defines the recent past ‘as a moving window of approximately fifty years time’. The choice of fifty years and their philosophy is based on the fact that in the United States buildings and sites are not considered eligible for the National Register (National Register of Historic Places, 2008a), if less than fifty years old, unless under exceptional circumstances (Sherfy and Luce, 1998). Different countries have different
cut-off dates for places to become ‘historic’ for registers and inventories, such as the thirty-year rule in England (Page, 1992).

Based on this, the term ‘recent’ will be interpreted in the context of this research as being post-1945, after the Second World War. That means that the period covered is roughly the last sixty years, or since the mid Twentieth Century. Landscapes from sixty years back can still be called recent. Often many of such landscapes are still in developmental phases, specifically their plantings, and are at times not fully completed. The fact that the study deals with ‘designed landscapes of the recent past’ or ‘recent landscapes’ highlight that these landscapes did not yet exist before this time. Another way to describe this period that could be used is the ‘immediate past’.

Covering the past sixty years is of particular interest as it highlights important issues in conservation and protection. Sites which are sixty to thirty years old fall just into the official ‘historic’ category, at least in the United Kingdom, if we consider the official thirty years rule (Page, 1992). More recent sites do not fall into this category meaning that other conservation issues may arise.

3.5 Traditional and novel landscape types and styles

Within the context of designed landscapes of the recent past the question of novel landscape types arises. Novel is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary (Soanes and Hawker, 2005) as ‘interestingly new or unusual’, with its origin in Latin being novellus, from novus ‘new’. In the recent past there have been a number of new types of designed landscapes, such as airport landscaping, shopping mall landscaping, and ‘streets in the skies’. These new types of landscapes are at times referred to as novel landscape types.

When speaking about designed landscapes of the recent past or novel landscapes it must not be forgotten that such sites can be designed in any style, more traditional, contemporary, and even mixed. Very frequently landscape design from the recent past is an addition to existing layers of landscape. Of course there are certain styles that only found their birth after 1945, but many styles that existed before 1945 have continued to be used in more recent times. Many of the most interesting and possibly in the long-term significant designed landscapes have been designed in the recent past.
in rather classical or traditional styles. Such styles have survived through history and over time have been accepted. Recent design styles and trends mostly end up out of fashion for a period of time, and many new materials that were developed and used, in a period that often opted for quantity rather than quality, still need to stand the test of time. Only time can tell how such styles and materials will be perceived in the future. A fact however is that for every period of history there are works that are of heritage significance. When speaking about designed landscapes from the recent past in this research, it therefore refers to a time period, and not stylistic fashions or periods.

3.6 Main categories of designed landscapes of the recent past

To clearly understand what is meant by designed landscapes of the recent past it is also essential to establish what types of landscapes fall under this definition. A clear overview of the different types of designed landscapes, in a classification or typology format, can assist in establishing the wider context of the subject. Literature resources already provide good documentation on this subject and a comparison of a number of existing classifications of types of designed landscapes is described hereafter and is illustrated in Table 3.1. In general, existing databases of designed landscapes, archival records, or overviews of designed landscapes make use of classification systems that incorporates a typology. Typologies are also used as tools in the assessment of the significance of designed landscapes. It is however not the aim of the study to prepare a comprehensive overview of all designed landscapes of the recent past in the United Kingdom, but later in the study examples of different types of designed landscapes will be given where appropriate.

A useful starting point to arrive at a typology is the database of parks and gardens that is kept at the University of York (UK Database of Historic Parks and Gardens, 2007). The initial database was established in the late 1990s in York with an aim to create a national inventory of historic parks, gardens and landscapes in England and Wales. The database always used a number of categories of usage to classify landscapes into different types. These categories reflect the purpose for which the place was designed at some historical point. This original use and the design in many cases has changed over the history, but the category that is used for each site reflects the period of greatest historical significance (UK Database of Historic Parks and Gardens, 2007).
The categories are divided under three main headings: Private residential; institutional and commercial; and public. These include:

A. Private residential
   • Single dwelling
   • Multiple dwellings
   • No dwelling
   • Communal Garden

B. Institutional and commercial
   • School, college, monastery, university
   • Museum, art gallery
   • Hospital, asylum
   • Cemetery, churchyard
   • Hotel, hostel
   • Office, public building
   • Industries, utilities, communications
   • Nursery garden
   • Open by subscription or ticket
   • Botanic garden, arboretum
   • Golf course

C. Public
   • Public park
   • Public walk
   • Recreational route

These are useful headings for a typology but its main focus is on historic sites, and it overlooks some types of designed landscapes. To assess what the possible gaps are, another typology to look at would be the English Heritage typology, with a special focus on recent sites. Fridy Duterloo-Morgan (2002a) prepared a draft typology for post-war landscapes with main categories and sub groups for English Heritage in 2002. Around that time English Heritage launched new investigations into the subject of post-1945 designed landscapes (Duterloo-Morgan, 2001) to inform their work on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens in England (Duterloo-Morgan, 2002b). In Duterloo-Morgan’s typology nine main type of groups were proposed with a number of sub-categories. Duterloo-Morgan’s initial go at a typology gives a clear and fairly
comprehensive overview. Some categories that can be seen in other classifications cannot immediately be found in Duterloo-Morgan’s list, but they can though easily and logically be added to the typology.

The typology of Duterloo-Morgan (2002a) lists the following categories:

1. Transport landscapes: Airports, motorways, ‘Streets in the sky’, railways, canals
2. Public amenity landscapes: Public parks, civic Schemes and master plans (including New Towns), town walks, playgrounds, seaside promenades
3. Leisure landscapes: Zoos, allotments, theme parks, caravan parks and campsites, water reservoirs, lido’s, swimming pools and leisure centres, golf courses, garden festivals, race tracks, ski resorts, country parks
4. Industrial landscapes: Quarries, factories, forestry, power stations, sewage works, water reservoirs, land reclamation
5. Institutional landscapes: Hospitals, prisons, schools, colleges and universities, cemeteries and churchyards, crematoria, government offices, libraries, museums and galleries (including sculpture gardens)
6. Military landscapes: Training areas, cold war sites, military graves, battlefields (Register for this in place), airfields
7. Commercial landscapes: Corporate gardens, shopping malls, department store roof gardens
8. Conservation and ecological oriented landscapes: Historic garden restorations, wildlife gardens, forests, National Parks, botanic gardens
9. Domestic: Housing estates public and private, private gardens (for single dwellings), communal gardens

This typology has many similarities with the typology of the UK Database of Historic Parks and Gardens, but provides more detail and some additional types of landscapes such as military landscapes and leisure landscapes, that appear to be missed out in the typology of the UK Database of Historic Parks and Gardens (2007). Duterloo-Morgan’s overview already gives a good idea of all types of landscapes that can be classified under recent designed landscapes, and therefore fall within the scope of this study.

Duterloo-Morgan (2002a). also indicates four overarching headings, or themes, under which the nine categories can be placed. These four main themes are:
• Living on the land: Housing and transport
• Making profits from the land: Industry, business and agriculture
• Governing and defending the land: Public institutions and military landscapes
• Enjoying the land: Leisure and public amenity

Another source that allows the comparisons of typology is Sheila Harvey and Stephen Rettig’s book on Fifty years of the Landscape Design, written in 1985 to look back at the key areas of work in the first half century of Landscape Design profession and the Landscape Institute in the United Kingdom (Harvey and Rettig, 1985). Harvey and Rettig look at key types of landscapes on which much work was done by Landscape Designers over the past fifty years, and this includes:

• Roads
• Industrial
• Public parks
• Ecological
• Housing landscapes
• Lidos
• Pleasure gardens
• Main landscape
• Forestry
• Reclamation (industrial, ecological, and others)

All these ten types of landscapes could also be found in the classification used by Duterloo-Morgan. Commercial, institutional and military landscapes are the three groups from Duterloo-Morgan’s typology that were not included by Harvey and Rettig (1985) in their book.

When comparing these typologies with other international examples it is of interest to look at the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. They list types of designed historic landscapes in the National Register Bulletin when describing how to evaluate and nominate such landscapes (Keller and Keller, 1994). The purpose of the typology list is described as to establish a consistent National Register designation for designed historic landscapes, this was to enable similar distinct landscape types to be evaluated using the same criteria (Keller 1993). They point out that of course some designed landscapes may incorporate several types of landscapes
and that when this is the case, the landscape is normally classified under the type that is most generally applicable to the site (Keller and Keller, 1994).

The list of Designed Historic Landscapes in the National Register Bulletin (Keller and Keller, 1994):

- Small residential grounds
- Estate or plantation grounds (including a farm where the primary significance is as a landscape design and not as historic agriculture)
- Arboreta, botanical, and display gardens
- Zoological gardens and parks
- Church yards and cemeteries
- Monuments and memorial grounds
- Plaza, square, green, mall or other public spaces
- Campus and institutional grounds
- City planning or civic design subdivisions and planned communities, resorts
- Commercial and industrial grounds and parks
- Parks (local, state, and national) and camp grounds
- Battlefield parks and other commemorative parks
- Grounds designed or developed for outdoor recreation and/or sports activities such as country clubs, golf courses, tennis courts, bowling greens, bridle trails, stadiums, ball parks, and race tracks that are not part of a unit listed above
- Fair and exhibition grounds
- Parkways, drives, and trails
- Bodies of water and fountains (considered as an independent component and not as part of a larger design scheme)

A comparison with Duterloo-Morgan’s typology shows again that the types of landscapes listed here, can be grouped under Duterloo-Morgan’s typology. The National Parks Service list only provides more examples of landscapes that fall under the main categories.

Another classification to compare the above-mentioned typologies with is the classification or typology of DOCOMOMO, the International Working Party for Documentation and Conservation of Buildings Sites and Neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement (DOCOMOMO International, 2007b). DOCOMOMO uses the
standardised categories of their Building Classification (DOCOMOMO United States, 2007a) for the preparation of their register fiches. The classification is part of the DOCOMOMO Directives for the National and Regional Registers which were prepared by the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers (2000).

The DOCOMOMO Register of significant sites has a focus on Modern buildings and sites and the fiches for the Register are prepared by national working parties following the directives and typology. National working parties can submit a selection of fiches to DOCOMOMO International for inclusion on the International Register. The standardized categories of the Building Classification include the following categories (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers, 2000):

- Administration: Parliamentary, government, civic and public buildings, Professional Institutions
- Commercial: Banks, markets, offices, public houses, restaurants, cafes, retailing, service premises, storage buildings
- Defence: Fortifications, military installations
- Education: Libraries, archives, record offices, research establishments, schools, universities and colleges
- Farming, Fishing: farming, fishing, fish farming, forestry, horticulture
- Funerary: Cemeteries, graveyards, crematoria, funerary, monuments, mausolea
- Health: Hospitals, surgeries, health centres
- Industrial: Building industries, ceramics, chemicals, engineering, extractive industries, Food and drink processing, marine construction, metal industries, textiles, wood-working industries
- Law: Law courts, penal institutions, police buildings
- Landscape: Agricultural settlement, botanic gardens, arboretums, forestry, land reclamation, national and regional parks
- Monuments: Public, commemorative monuments, sculpture (free-standing)
- Public services: Baths, swimming pools, cleansing services, district heating, electricity supply, fire, ambulance services, gas supply, hydraulic power supply, sanitary provision, water supply, drainage, sewage disposal
- Recreation: Cinemas, concert halls, museums, art galleries, pavilions, club houses, private halls, clubs, public parks, gardens, sports centres, gymnasia, stadia, sports grounds, theatres
• Religion: Cathedrals, chapels, churches, mosques, synagogues, temples and other places of worship, church halls, meeting houses, religious centres, seminaries, presbyteries, manses, monasteries, convents, religious houses, shrines, places of pilgrimage

• Residential: Castles, palaces, fortified houses, communal housing, country houses, mansions, large villas, hotels, inns, multi-storey flats, small detached houses, cottages, tenements, low flats, terraced cottages

• Transport, communications: Broadcasting, bus and coach services, canals, civil aviation, postal services, railways, roads, paths, shipping, telecommunications, tramways

• Urbanism: New towns and villages, town extensions, urban development, reconstruction

• Unclassified

While the DOCOMOMO typology has a stronger focus on buildings, the types of buildings can be put into the same categories as used by Duterloo-Morgan.

From this comparison of typologies and the overview in Table 3.1, it can be concluded that several useful typologies exist, each for their own specific purposes. Aside from the typology by Duterloo-Morgan (2002a) and of Harvey and Rettig (1985), none had a specific focus on designed landscapes of the recent past. The four main themes and nine sub-categories used by Duterloo-Morgan (2002a) make up the most comprehensive overview, under which all categories from the other classifications can be placed. The other classifications included similar types of designed landscapes, but some appear to be less detailed, while others have missed out some types of designed landscapes.

It can be concluded that there will always be a need for a variety of typologies as no single one will fit all purposes. Nevertheless some typologies have obvious gaps, and overlook important groups of designed landscapes, which should be avoided. For this study it can be concluded that Duterloo-Morgan’s typology (2002a) provides a comprehensive reference framework for organising and understanding the categories of designed landscapes of the recent past. As can be seen in Table 3.1, all the types of landscapes that were mentioned in the studied literature, can be organised under Duterloo-Morgan’s four overarching headings.
Table 3.1: A comparison of classifications to inform a typology for designed landscapes of the recent past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living on the land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic: Housing estates public and private, private gardens (for single dwellings), communal gardens</td>
<td>Housing Landscapes</td>
<td>Private residential: Single dwelling, multiple dwellings, no dwelling, communal Garden</td>
<td>Small residential grounds</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport landscapes: Airports, motorways, ‘streets in the sky’, railways, canals</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Public: Recreational route</td>
<td>Parkways, drives, and trails</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making profits from the land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial landscapes: quarries, factories, forestry, power stations, sewage works, water reservoirs, land reclamation</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Institutional and commercial: Industries, utilities, communications</td>
<td>Commercial and industrial grounds and parks</td>
<td>Industrial, farming, fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial landscapes: Corporate gardens, shopping malls, department store roof gardens</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Institutional and commercial: Hotel, hostel, office, public building, open by subscription or ticket, golf course</td>
<td>Commercial and industrial grounds and parks</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing and defending the land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Institutional landscapes:
- Hospitals, prisons, schools, colleges and universities,
cemeteries and churchyards,
- Crematoria,
- Government offices,
- Libraries, museums and galleries
  (including sculpture gardens)

### Institutional and commercial:
- School, college, monastery, university, museum,
- Art gallery, hospital, asylum, nursery garden

### Campus and institutional grounds,
- Churchyards and cemeteries

### Administration, education, health,
- Law, public services, religion, funerary

### Military landscapes:
- Training areas, cold war sites, military graves, battlefields, airfields

### Battlefield parks and other commemorative parks

### Defense

### Enjoying the land

#### Public amenity landscapes:
- Public parks, civic Schemes and master plans
  (including New Towns), town walks, playgrounds, seaside promenades

#### Public Parks

#### Public: Public park,
- Public walk, institutional and commercial, churchyard

#### City planning or civic design subdivisions and planned communities,
- Resorts, plaza, square, green, mall, other public spaces

#### Urbanism

#### Leisure landscapes:
- Zoos, allotments, theme parks, caravan parks and camp sites,
  water reservoirs, lido’s, swimming pools and leisure centers,
  golf courses, garden festivals, race tracks, ski resorts, country parks

#### Pleasure gardens, lidos

#### Grounds designed or developed for outdoor recreation and/or sports activities
  such as country clubs, golf courses, tennis courts, bowling greens, bridle trails, stadiums, ball parks,
  and race tracks that are not part of a unit listed above; fair and exhibition grounds;
  zoological gardens and parks

#### Recreation
### 3.7 Defining conservation

The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (ICOMOS Australia, 1999) defines conservation as ‘…all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance. It includes maintenance and may according to circumstance include preservation, restoration, reconstruction and adaptation and will be commonly a combination of more than one of these…’ (ICOMOS Australia, 1999).

Interpreting the definition of conservation, the National Trust for Scotland (2003b) highlights the element of managing change and endeavours ‘…to ensure that change is managed by negotiation so that present and future generations may enjoy the benefits of places or features of significance….’. It is important to recognise that conservation is an ongoing responsibility (ICOMOS Australia, 1999) but it also must be recognised that, as David Lambert makes clear, ‘…conservation is not “on behalf of” future generations…we preserve first for ourselves, for the quality of our own life and environment, and for our own peace of mind…’ (Lambert, 2000).
The Burra Charter (ICOMOS Australia, 1999) describes reasons why we should conserve places of cultural significance by explaining that these places ‘...enrich people’s lives, often providing a deep and inspirational sense of connection to community and landscape, to the past and to lived experiences...’. It adds that such places are important historical records and expressions of identity and experience, and tell us about who we are and the past that has formed us. Conservation should not only be about preserving the past, but the history of a landscape should be seen as part of the whole environment, and hence can make an important contribution to the value of place and the quality of life (Lambert, 2000).

3.7.1 International charters and principles and the conservation of designed landscapes

The issues that this study explores must also be seen within the context of existing charters and guidelines. Since the 1970s professional techniques for identifying, documenting, evaluating and conserving historic landscapes have greatly advanced and they are still continually being refined (Birnbaum, 2001). Conservation of historic landscapes is now a well-established discipline with defined approaches and conservation principles, with many conservation organisations and a huge audience. Lambert describes how before the Second World War little consensus existed on preservation but that it was in the 1980s that heritage, the historic environment, and heritage industry boomed vigorously (Lambert, 2000). The National Trust (2008c) which initially attracted a rather elitist audience, saw its membership boom from 200,000 in 1970 to 1 million in 1980 and 2 million in 1990. By 2007 it had reached 3.5 million (Lambert, 2000). Lambert points out that it should not be forgotten that this all happened while in the 1990s the focus on heritage was bypassed by environmentalism and at present this area receives more attention and as a result, more resources.

Since 1970s, and the increased attention for heritage conservation, several conservation organisations have developed a number of international conservation charters and conventions which set out principles relevant to the conservation of gardens and designed landscapes. ICOMOS (2008e) established several key charters that have been most influential in the development of conservation. The Charter of Venice by ICOMOS (1964) was one of the earliest international charters with a focus on the preservation of Historic Monuments. The Charter of Florence (ICOMOS-IFLA,
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1982) for the conservation of historic gardens and parks sets out specific principles for maintenance, conservation, restoration, reconstruction, and use. The Burra Charter, was adopted in 1979 by ICOMOS Australia (1979) and moved on from the Charter of Venice inasmuch as it served as a Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance. It has been widely accepted worldwide as the standard for heritage conservation practice.

Many conservation organisations and governments have adopted the ICOMOS charters. In addition governments and organisations also have developed supplementary charters or more up-to-date guidelines and policies. The Council of Europe prepared in 2000 a landscape specific convention, the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000). This is one of the most recent landscape specific conventions and sets out a series of general and specific measures which are to be undertaken by states which sign it. The United Kingdom signed the Convention on 21 February 2006, ratified it in June 2006 (ICOMOS UK, 2006), and in March 2007 the Convention officially came into effect in the United Kingdom (Council of Europe, 2008). The Convention provides a coherent and sensible framework for addressing landscape issues, and was adopted by many conservation organisations, such as the National Trust for Scotland (2005a), even before the United Kingdom officially signed the Convention in 2006. The five specific measures that are highlighted in the Convention as requiring more focus and attention are; awareness-raising, training and education, identification and assessment, landscape quality objectives, implementation (Council of Europe, 2000). These themes are also applicable to the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past and will again come up in the later research.

3.7.2 The conservation process

There is a need to study the issues and problems with the conservation of designed landscapes in relation to the whole conservation process. Guidelines point out that conservation includes all the processes of looking after a place to retain its significance (ICOMOS Australia, 1999), and also describe that conservation is an integral part of the management of places (ICOMOS Australia, 1999). Conservation is not a discipline in itself, but should be seen as a skilled process that is common to several disciplines (National Trust for Scotland, 2003b), and as an ongoing responsibility.
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The practical conservation of designed landscapes consists of two main parallel processes that are closely interlinked (Coffin and Belavia, 1998):

- **Conservation Maintenance and Stewardship:** This ensures that the gardens and landscapes are properly maintained, management and open to the wider public for access, enjoyment and interpretation. It also includes the implementation of major conservation projects.

- **Conservation Planning and Research:** This ensures that proper research is done towards the understanding and assessment of gardens and landscapes. It enables the agreement on long-term aims and objectives for sites, set priorities, implement fundraising and the consultation and involvement of stakeholders and partners.

Different organisations formulate the detailed conservation process in slightly different ways, but in general the same steps should recur. From a comparison of the Conservation Principles of the National Trust for Scotland (2003b), which formulate a process for the delivery of conservation, and documentation of the National Park Service in the United States (Birnbaum, 2001) it can be conclude that the conservation process in general involves the following steps (National Trust for Scotland, 2003b):

1. Survey, research and understanding, including historical research and documenting the existing conditions;
2. Site analysis, an evaluation of the integrity, and a statement of significance;
3. Development of policy, or conservation approach, with aims and objectives, and a clear management philosophy;
4. Management to an agreed plan and programme, including a strategy for maintenance; and
5. Monitoring activities, keeping records, reviewing approaches, and preparing recommendations for future research.

What is important is that in the conservation of designed landscapes, these steps are not always sequential and also are not independent of each other, and must be looked at within the context of the entire property (Birnbaum, 2001). The potential significance of a single feature within a site may, however, not be forgotten. For example, a flower garden, walled garden, or even individual trees, built structures, or water features. Individual features in designed landscapes gain significance from their role as elements of the entire site. In order to ensure that the balance of a garden or designed...
landscapes is not disrupted, the conservation needs of individual items need to be assessed within this wider context.

While conservation of sites concentrates primarily upon the features within the property boundary, planning should also consider the site in a wider context, relating it to its historic setting, including that covered by surrounding estates, its contribution to the local landscape character, and to the wider environment and socio-economic context. A conservation plan should discuss how wider issues and circumstances outside the control of the owners or management team may affect the significance of the site and should develop aspirational policies to address these.

Of importance is also that the conservation process is an ongoing responsibility, with recurring activities, and not a one-off project. When dealing with designed landscapes managing change is one of the most important aspects as they are living, dynamic ecosystems that change, grow, and evolve. Change may include deliberate management-instigated change, environmental change, whether incremental or large-scale and sudden, and changes in external influences, for example society, legislation or funding sources. An important influence and often threat for designed landscapes of the recent past are fashion changes. The essence of designed landscapes work becomes the management of that change. The conservation process should not set out to halt this natural process of change and attempt to preserve designed landscapes in a literal sense. The process of natural change and evolution will contribute in designed landscapes to their interest and the interest for visitors.

That the conservation of designed landscapes encapsulates a whole range of different actions can also be concluded from looking at the key measures to be undertaken by parties that sign up to the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000). Under general measures the Convention requests parties to recognise landscapes in law, to establish and implement landscape policies and procedures for the participation by stakeholders, and to integrate landscape into planning. Under the specific measures the Convention asks parties to take action towards awareness-raising, training and education, identification and assessment, the defining of landscape quality objectives for sites, and the implementation of landscape policies. Important is also that the Convention argues for cooperation.
Similar objectives can be found in the corporate objectives and mission statements of key conservation organisations and bodies. For example the National Trust, a charity working to preserve and protect the coastline, countryside and buildings of England, Wales and Northern Ireland, does so through caring and conservation of heritage sites they own, but also through learning and discovery, and by encouraging millions of people to visit and enjoy the sites they manage (National Trust, 2008e). The National Trust for Scotland describes itself as ‘...the conservation charity that protects and promotes Scotland’s natural and cultural heritage for present and future generations to enjoy...’ (National Trust for Scotland, 2005b). They aim to achieve this objective by directly owning or managing sites, by engaging with all sections of society and by campaigning for the whole of Scotland’s heritage (National Trust for Scotland, 2005b). In the Corporate Plan for the National Trust for Scotland (2005b) this translated into four key objectives:

- Conservation
- Access, education, interpretation
- Influence, reputation
- Organisation and resources

The National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland certainly have some of the most wide-ranging corporate conservation objectives in the world. National Trusts in other countries will mostly have similar objectives. Other organisations have a more specific focus. For example the Garden History Society (2008b) in the United Kingdom does not manage or own sites, and has a clear specialist focus on history and policy work. The Cultural Landscape Foundation (2008d) is the only non-profit foundation in America dedicated to increasing the public’s awareness of the importance and irreplaceable legacy of cultural landscapes. They work mainly through education, technical assistance, and outreach.

### 3.8 Categories of main stakeholders involved in the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past

After clarifying the conservation process it is of importance for the purpose of this research to establish the main stakeholders that are involved in the conservation process of designed landscapes.
Conservation principles for gardens and designed landscapes refer to conservation as a skilled process common to several disciplines, rather than a discipline in itself. Conservation principles emphasise the importance of a holistic approach and demand that all the actions of the conservation process should be carried out in an integrated multidisciplinary fashion. To achieve this, conservation as a whole relies on the support of a wide range of professionals and the involvement of non-professional people. The principles underlying the process is that it must be familiar to all working within cultural and natural heritage disciplines and that it is important that all people involved, including on-site staff, owners, and stakeholders should respect the same agreed process to give consistency in decision-making, and that the process should be transparent and based upon involvement and consultation. Successful long-term conservation and care of designed landscapes requires strong inter-disciplinary actions and it is therefore essential that there is a wider awareness about the different aspects and values of designed landscapes. Those involved should work closely together with other disciplines to deliver its objectives.

There are an infinite number of stakeholders, or people and organisations, that are in one way or another involved in the conservation of designed landscapes, and about which there can be found documentation in literature, including on the internet. Several existing sources describe categories of stakeholders or actors in the conservation of landscapes. Some of these sources will be compared to arrive at a useful list of main stakeholders within the context of this research.

A list by Sir Bernard Fielden and Jukka Jokilehto (1993) (Table 3.2) illustrates that conservation relies on a wide range of experts. It is as important to recognise that activities related to the conservation of designed landscapes happen at diverse levels and scales. Activities can literally take place at a site-specific level, at local, regional, national and international level, and all simultaneously.
Table 3.2: A list of experts involved in conservation (Fielden and Jokilehto, 1993).

- administrators
- anthropologists
- antiquarians
- archaeologists
- architects
- architectural conservators
- archivists
- art historians
- biologists
- botanists
- building surveyors
- chemists
- conservators (of collections)
- craftspersons
- curators
- documentalists
- ecologists
- economic historians
- engineers (all sorts)
- entomologists
- ethnologists
- geographers
- geologists
- heritage recorders
- historians
- hydrologists
- landscape architects
- legislators
- mineralogists
- museologists
- palaeontologists
- politicians
- property managers
- seismologists
- sociologists
- surveyors
- urban planners
- valuers
- vulcanologists
- others

The European Heritage Network (2008b) also groups on its HEREIN Internet database European heritage related stakeholders. HEREIN is an information system of the Council of Europe with a focus on cultural heritage conservation. It lists European governmental departments responsible and involved in cultural heritage conservation and gives overviews of who is who and who is doing what at the European level. One disadvantage is that it can never be fully up to date, but nevertheless it provides a good overview on national heritage policies, European and international cooperation and European heritage programmes. Under national heritage policies a search by country and theme can be done. The most useful theme for our exercise is the ‘Agents (Organisations and People)’ information which is structured in seven categories (European Heritage Network, 2008b):

1. National administrations
2. Regional and local government
3. Enterprises
4. Professional membership organisations
5. Voluntary initiatives
6. Networks
7. National training structures

These are useful headings to structure stakeholders involved in heritage activities but for our research purpose these must be further developed within the context of designed landscapes. To do this the 1995 feasibility study for an organisation in the United Kingdom to assist with the conservation of historic parks and gardens by
Elisabeth Banks Associates (Banks and Longstaff-Gowan, 1995) is helpful. This study researched many possible organisations and their activities and comprises a table with organisations and individuals involved in historic parks and gardens (Banks and Longstaff-Gowan, 1995). This table lists four main categories:

1. Day to day management (Groups of Owner/Manager): Manager, owner, head gardener, forester, farm manager, tenant, gamekeeper, ghillie, and waterkeeper.
2. Disciplines: Architect, surveyor, archaeologist, garden designer, landscape architect, land agent, forestry adviser, and farm adviser.
3. Agencies: Such as English Heritage, local authority, Countryside Commission, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, and others.
4. Voluntary Bodies: Such as the Garden History Society, Historic Houses Association, National Council for the Conservation of Plants and Gardens, and others.

When speaking about agencies the feasibility study by Elisabeth Banks Associates (Banks and Longstaff-Gowan, 1995) specified this as government agencies directly involved in the conservation of historic parks and gardens. In relation to voluntary bodies they also listed organisations under: Other organisations, mostly voluntary, involved in the conservation of historic parks and gardens; voluntary organisations, supported mainly by members; and other organisations, acting as role models (Banks and Longstaff-Gowan, 1995). Other areas of importance that were highlighted were education and fundraising.

In the publication ‘Historic Parks and Gardens in the Planning System: A Handbook’, by Christopher Dingwall and David Lambert (1997) the authors clarify relevant legislation and guidance in the United Kingdom and in doing so also refer to several categories, including:

- The international context
- The national planning framework
- The local and regional planning framework (including local authorities)
- Consultees and amenity groups
- Charitable trusts and organisations
A last source that was used to assist in exploring the context of designed landscapes is the handbook ‘Researching a Garden’s History: A Guide to Documentation and Published Sources’ (Lambert et al., 1995). It provides another checklist of stakeholders to consider when researching a site and uses three overarching categories (Lambert et al., 1995): Owners and occupiers; designers; and gardeners, estate managers, stewards, responsible committees. Private and public repositories, such as archives, museums, and libraries are pointed out for their importance as resources of reference material, while publishers of reference books, journals, maps and magazines are also mentioned (Lambert et al., 1995).

By comparing the various sources and lists of stakeholders we arrived at seven main categories of stakeholders as illustrated in Table 3.3. A degree of overlap between categories is unavoidable but it is believed that within the context of this research these seven categories provide a sound basis to further assess in the next chapters the roles and actions of these stakeholder categories and validate the findings of the initial literature review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Categories</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Agency or Government Organisations</td>
<td>International, national, regional and local governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Charitable Trusts and Voluntary Organisations</td>
<td>Voluntary bodies and initiatives, trusts, non-governmental organisations, local community groups, amenity groups, professional membership organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Enterprises and Consultants</td>
<td>Landscaping and construction companies, commercial enterprises, publishers, consultants and advisers in various disciplines, garden designer, landscape architects, architects, surveyors, archaeologists, land agents, forestry advisers, farm advisers, horticulturalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Training and Educational Institutions</td>
<td>Academic and research institutions, national training structures, educational institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9 Key roles of stakeholder categories

3.9.1 Government authorities and agencies

Government authorities and agencies share key responsibilities for the conservation, protection, presentation and promotion of the built heritage and the historic environment. Most important roles are to advise on, develop and formulate government policy, as well as promote an understanding of the historic environment and existing information by all appropriate means. One of their responsibilities is to survey and record the historic environment and compile, maintain and publish monument records, inventories and statutory lists as a record of the historical environment. This is essential for protecting heritage but also to understand the width of the existing heritage. The government authorities share planning responsibilities and install tools for planning control, which include responsibilities for land-use planning and advice on planning issues. Local authorities have a responsibility for determining planning consent and for caring for the historic environment through the local planning process. For these purposes most local authorities have conservation officers. The government has a responsibility for funding heritage through the administration of grant aid and tax relief. Much government work is done in partnership with the full range of private and public organisations. The government also liaises with international governments and bodies such as with UNESCO on matters relating to the World Heritage Sites. The government also has a responsibility for the maintenance, repair and presentation of properties that are in public ownership or guardianship. In the United Kingdom there is at present not one single government body that is responsible for conservation of historic and designed landscapes and botanical plant collections, a problem that is raised as a shortcoming by many organisations (National Trust, 2008b). In the meantime the responsibilities over historic landscapes sits within the scope of several governmental agencies and bodies.
3.9.2 Charitable trusts and voluntary organisations

Charitable organisations are all non-profit organisations with charitable purposes, and many have a large membership, but it is important to note that not all non-profit organisations are charities. Voluntary organisations are groups of individuals who on a voluntary basis aim to accomplish certain purposes. In 2009 there were almost 179,000 registered charities in the United Kingdom (Charity Commission, 2009). These organisations make up one of the largest and most active groups of people involved in the care and protection of heritage sites and historic designed landscapes in the United Kingdom and they are active in a very wide range of initiatives.

Specific purposes and roles of such organisations that are active within the context of this research vary much, as will their size, number of staff or involved persons, budgets, influence and reputation. In reality these organisations and groups are active in all types of activities that are associated with the conservation of designed landscapes. The key question in this study is to understand better which of these organisations are making significant contributions to initiatives that relate to the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past, and in which areas there are still important gaps and problems.

To assist in this analysis the research looked at some international organisations and those active in the United Kingdom. Many organisations in the United Kingdom do play important roles at an international level and have strong links with organisations abroad. To understand the present situation a number of organisations that are active in other countries will be briefly analysed. Given the wide variety of activities that these organisations are involved in, the survey will list conclusions under a series of key areas of activities.

3.9.3 Enterprises and consultants

Within the subject of designed landscapes there are a vast range of enterprises active and similarly many consultancy practices in various disciplines are involved in the conservation of designed landscapes. Enterprises are involved in all levels of activities such as maintenance, management, construction, and fabrication of material. The analysis will focus on involvements of landscape enterprises and consultants that are active in the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past, with an emphasis
on publishers, contractors, landscape consultancies and professional membership organisations. Professional consultants that are involved in the conservation of designed landscapes include horticulturalists, garden designers, landscape architects, architects, surveyors, archaeologists, land agents, and forestry and farm advisers. The work by publishers will also be highlighted as they play a key role in raising awareness.

3.9.4 Private and public repositories

Record keeping is an essential aspect of conservation and proper records should be kept about all decisions and processes of conservation so that they are open to scrutiny and can be understood by those involved in the future and at present (National Trust for Scotland, 2003b). Ideally records are kept on all aspects of the site, including design and planning, collections, history and evaluation, and management and conservation. This is however rarely the case.

Private and public repositories, such as archives, museums, libraries, university collections, and documentary collections are most important for keeping archives of designed landscapes of the recent past. Such institutions are set up to keep records and therefore play in the long-term a most important role in the conservation process.

3.9.5 Training and educational institutions

Learning activities and programmes are essential to inform and educate people in all categories and disciplines that play a role in the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past. Training and educational institutions play a key role in this but other stakeholders, such as companies, governmental and non-governmental organisations also have an important role to play towards training professionals. Later in the study the research will also highlight that there is a general need for more training opportunities and for more skilled professionals to look after designed landscapes from any time period, whether old or from the recent past.

3.9.6 Day to day management

The people that are involved in the day to day operations and maintenance of a site play obviously a most important role in the conservation of landscapes of the recent past. As Table 3.3 illustrates, this includes a large variety of people, ranging from the
owners and occupiers, to professionals and experts with diverse skills, and managers, responsible committees, and trustees.

3.9.7 Wider public and visitors

The wider public and visitors are key users of sites or have often close associations with sites, such as local residents or neighbours. Many such people are very engaged in sites, whether for example as a member of a charity that looks after sites, or as volunteers or donors. In the consultation process they are a key stakeholder group and through consultation and participation they must play a key role in the conservation process.

3.10 Conclusions

This chapter identified the main types of designed landscapes of the recent past that fall within the scope of this research. It also clarified the role of conservation and the complex nature of the conservation process and the involvement of experts and categories of stakeholders. This understanding of the scope and context of the study will assist our research into the existing problems and concerns that at present exist in relation to the conservation of landscapes of the recent past. The categories of stakeholders will also be used as a framework for the assessment of the roles and actions of stakeholders. This will provide a better understanding of how successful existing recommendations have been implemented to date by the main stakeholders. The research methodology will be further explained and clarified in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR

4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

After the literature review and the clarification of key terminology and stakeholders in the previous chapters, this chapter now presents the research methodology that will be used to explore the state of the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past and the main concerns and issues with such conservation, and why the chosen methodology is considered appropriate for this type of study.

4.2 Chosen Methodology: A qualitative methodology

The term ‘methodology’ is described in the Oxford English Dictionary as ‘a system of methods used in a particular field’ to develop knowledge in such field (Soanes and Hawker, 2005). The chosen methodology must be decided upon by the nature of the research question or the hypothesis (Rudestam and Newton, 1992). The methodology must enable the comparison of theoretical findings and the empirical or evidence based data or experiences (Rudestam and Newton, 1992). Within the context of our study this means that it must assist in establishing the relationship between the theoretical and empirical findings about the current problems regarding the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past. In other words, how do key findings, from the literature, relate to the practical experiences gathered during this research.

To capture such practical realities a qualitative method was selected for this research and not a quantitative. The main aim of the surveys is not to arrive at a set of statistics and figures. It is of less importance to know how often certain factors or issues occur, but more essential to find out which factors occur and what opinions exist. Qualitative research can be described as a field of inquiry that crosscuts disciplines and subject matters (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005) which is essential for our research questions. Therefore a qualitative method was seen as the most appropriate way to gather the needed data, information, and have understanding. A qualitative research is often
conducted as a preliminary step towards quantitative data. That is because a qualitative research is more exploratory or hypothesis generating (Creswell, 2003), while a quantitative research will test the hypothesis. The outcomes of this qualitative research can inform whether in the future a quantitative survey is required to elaborate certain factors and outcomes. In the course of the surveys it however became clear that some of the gathered data provides some interesting statistics. Even though this was not the initial aim of the survey, for their usefulness, some statistics will be included in the results.

4.3 Appropriate research method: Case study method

From the literature review in Chapter Two and the conclusions about the categories of main stakeholders in Chapter Three (Table 3.3) it became evident that two approaches will be required to explore the key research questions and arrive at a better understanding of the subject. There is a need to study the wider context or ‘the general’ and the more site-specific context or ‘the particular’:

- **The wider context:** Through the additional investigation into published sources and data, such as the inventories of historic landscapes, the wider context or ‘the general’ can be studied in detail. This investigation will assist with validating and cross-examining the findings of the literature review. Existing frameworks for the protection of sites, conservation approaches, and initiatives are analysed to enable a better cross-examination and comparison of existing measures. Chapters Five, Six and Seven will present the findings of this part of the research.

- **The site-specific context:** To enable the collection and analysis of data from different categories of stakeholders from a site-specific perspective or ‘the particular’, and most importantly also from people involved in the day to day management of sites and the wider public, a case study survey is required. The findings of the case study survey are presented in Chapter Eight. The case study survey allows further cross-examination and validation of findings from the literature review and wider context.

To answer the research questions within the context of ‘the general’ or wider context, literature sources such as published documents and internet resources were used, together with the investigation of work done by stakeholders. In doing so, this review
describes, summarises, and evaluates the content of primary reports, but does not report new primary scholarship itself (Cooper, 1998). A problem with the additional literature review into the wider context is that this does not provide us with sufficient information from the perspective of the stakeholder categories of people closely involved in the day to day management of sites, visitors and the wider public. To address the gap in understanding with regards to ‘the particular’ or site-specific context, there is a need to collect original data and information. Primary research or field research using case studies is seen as a most appropriate and suitable method for data collection, and to provide novel insight to the research question. For this reason it was decided to use field surveys under a case study method. Through case studies it is possible to collect and analyse data and information following systematic methods and develop the required in-depth examination of a case. The survey will also provide insight towards areas for more extensive future research (Yin, 2002).

From the literature it appears that a case study survey has not yet been used to explore our research question in relation to the categories of stakeholders that we wish to study. A research report that used a comparative case study survey method is the dissertation by Adam Stanners (2007). Stanners explored in his research why Modern architecture is unpopular and if any correlation can be found between a lack of understanding of the designers’ intentions and the unpopularity of Modern buildings. Stanners used interview techniques to gather responses relating to a series of twelve criticisms. He explored reactions from about thirty respondents to these criticisms using twenty-six case study buildings. While this is an example of a similar research method and related subject area the outcomes of Stanners’ dissertation do not apply to the context of designed landscapes and have a completely different research question. Stanners’ study was an excellent research and useful example to inform our approach, but from literature review it appeared that no other authors had explored the research question of our research using a case study method.

Case study research can be based on single or multiple case studies. For the purpose of our research multiple case studies were used. Multiple case studies follow a replication logic. Each individual case study consisted of several fact gathering exercises targeting a number of respondents. The respondents were asked the same questions and this at several case study sites. This resulted in retrieving data from multiple sources, which assists in the verification of its authenticity. From a comparison
of data and facts from all case studies conclusions were drawn. Case studies can assist in generating and testing a hypothesis (Flyvbjerg, 2006). In our research the literature review had already provided us with a series of concerns and existing recommendations. The case study method allowed us to test and verify some of these concerns and in addition generate new aspects of the hypothesis, or existing problems and concerns.

A case study method has to fulfil three important criteria including reliability, internal validity and external validity (Rudestam and Newton, 1992). Reliability is concerned with the consistency of results and the replication of the study under similar circumstances. Two different people in similar circumstances could have conducted the case studies and we are of the opinion that the conclusions would have been the same. Reliability can be achieved in several ways. Of importance for our case studies is the protocol followed that was based on set questions and ways of documenting and analysing data (Tellis, 1997). Internal validity is achieved in our case studies as the method does produce findings that contribute to a better understanding of the theory. External validity addresses the question whether the findings relate to the whole population and can be generalised beyond the immediate case (Tellis, 1997). The case studies related directly to the investigated subject, making them externally valid.

Disadvantages of case studies include the limited access and availability of respondents (Robson, 1993). This was addressed in several ways. First of all by arranged interviews and targeted mailings of questionnaires to people involved at the case study sites. With a restricted number of people involved in some of the day to day management of certain sites this problem was also minimal. This is more complex when speaking about the wider public and visitors. The combination of unarranged interviews and planned interviews and questionnaires with visitors and neighbours, and the high number of contacted persons, assisted in overcoming this. Another disadvantage may be that the responses do not represent the actual situation, but only the peripheries of the situation. The snowballing technique (Sarantakos, 1993) was used to overcome this. Respondents were asked if they could recommend other people to partake in the survey. As a result the sample amounted to the necessary respondents to overcome this. Case studies are also argued as to provide limited basis for scientific generalisation (Yin, 2002). This relates to the fact that scientific experiments are rarely based on single experiments but instead on a multiple set of
Chapter Four: Methodology

experiments. Because the case study is an intensive method and because it is carried out over a length of time with multiple case studies, this overcomes this argument. The lack of rigor and bias by the investigator in case studies is often seen as a disadvantage (Yin, 2002). By using multiple case studies and multiple sources of evidence, with a high number of respondents and set questionnaires and interviews, this was avoided.

While there are certain disadvantages to case study methods of investigations, it remains a very useful method if cross-examination and triangulation is used. This is the case in our research and will be discussed next.

4.4 Methods of Data Collection

With the case study method of investigation allowing the use of multiple sources of evidence to gather data, the use of triangulation is required.

4.4.1 Triangulation

Triangulation is an analytical approach that allows synthesising data from multiple sources through collection, examination, comparison and interpretation. Triangulation is basically a process by which a particular problem is investigated from different perspectives (Holloway, 1997). Different data gathering techniques and methods to investigate the issues can be used to collect vital information (Denzin, 1978). The use of various techniques allows obtaining information on the same issue, which would not be possible with one method only. Through the cross-examination of one result against another it is possible to arrive at sound findings, which in turn can inform suggestions for action or recommendations. An important benefit of triangulation is an increase in the reliability of the findings as it can overcome the deficiencies of one single method. By using different methods and even by arriving at contradictory results, triangulation assists in reaching fundamental understanding about the research question.

In this research the findings of the literature review and the case study survey will be cross-examined and allow a synthesis with a new hypothesis and recommendations for action and further research. For example, from the literature review and collection of existing theoretical perspectives certain conclusions by professionals and academics regarding suggestions and recommendations for actions were found. By cross-
examining these results with the new data from the case study survey, which involves people at sites, the reliability of results increases and gaps or deficiencies from the literature review can be addressed. By combining the data from the different methods the research produces a result that looks in an original way at the subject.

This approach towards triangulation and combining methods of investigation is referred to by researchers as the between-method triangulation, also called the inner-method or across-method triangulation. The between-method triangulation allows researchers to confirm the findings from one particular method by another (Holloway, 1997). In our research, the literature review allows for an exploratory study to identify issues. These findings are further refined and validated by using additional investigation into published sources and data, such as the inventories of historic landscapes. This approach is a form of theory triangulation, which uses different theoretical perspectives in the study of one problem (Holloway, 1997). The case study survey is a type of data triangulation, which allows the gathering of data from different groups of people, at various locations and times. To achieve this the case study method in the research makes use of three techniques for triangulation purposes; questionnaires, structured interviews and unstructured interviews. As a basis for all case study collecting techniques a standard list of open questions was developed to evoke any answers and encourage the subject to expand on any particular point. The open-ended approach was aimed at securing a broad range of views on the topic.

4.4.2 Questionnaires

In a questionnaire a series of questions are used for data collection. Effective questionnaires require sufficient planning beforehand to ascertain that the results can be analysed and that the questions provide the researcher with the needed responses. Questions must be clear and enable the collection of the desired data. For this reason the questionnaire was piloted in a pilot interview in Spring 2006. After the pilot some final adjustments were made with the questionnaires and interviews being conducted in the Summer and Autumn of 2006.

Aside from interviews a number of questionnaires in printed format, with stamped envelope for returns, were posted to respondents. Some questionnaires were sent out using e-mail. The main advantage of mailed questionnaires was that a high number of
questionnaires can be mailed to facilitate a larger number of responses. There was no need for the researcher to be present for completion but the questionnaires did require a follow-up as there are always delays in responses and non-returns. A disadvantage with mailed questionnaires is always that the response rate can be comparatively low. Another disadvantage of questionnaires is that answers cannot as easily be clarified as with interviews, but where it was felt to be necessary, follow up telephone calls were conducted.

The respondents could submit their responses in the format they preferred, allowing for handwritten written letters, typed responses and e-mail responses. E-mail responses were encouraged as it would mean that responses were already available in digital format. When postal services were used the handwritten notes or printed out text were typed-up and digitised. All responses were transferred into the format of the standard response sheet to facilitate the analysis and comparison of responses.

4.4.3 Interviews

The interviews used the same list of questions as the posted questionnaires. Two types of interviews were used:

- **Structured interviews**: The structured interviews were performed based on a pre-arranged meeting and followed the questions of the questionnaire. These interviews had varying lengths and took on average between thirty minutes and one and a half hours. Most interviews were conducted one person at a time, with a couple double interviews.

- **Unstructured interviews**: These were performed in various circumstances and were very variable in length. Some door-to-door calls were made in site’s neighbourhoods, a number of locals were interviewed on the street, and visitors and volunteers were asked questions at sites.

In total sixty-four members of the public were interviewed and full interviews generally took over an hour. Each interview was recorded with a digital device. After each interview the responses were typed up and put into the standard response sheet format. The unstructured interviews were performed in various circumstances and were variable in length. With the door-to-door calls, and interviews with locals on the street, no recording device was used, and only handwritten notes were made by the
interviewer, after which the interview responses were typed up using a standard
response sheet format. Some unstructured interviews were also conducted in
conjunction with questionnaires to follow-up some responses given by respondents to
a questionnaire.

Given the fact that open questions are used the interview technique was most suitable.
Questionnaires with numerous open questions have their advantages, but interviews
with typical respondents often result in more emerging topics. For example, an
advantage of interviews over questionnaires was that if an answer was unclear, the
interviewer could immediately ask the interviewee for more clarification of the
statement. Another advantage of the interview technique was that it is possible to
obtain confidential information, which is not possible with questionnaires. Trust
between the interviewer and the interviewee is important for successful responses.
Most interviews were conducted one person at a time which allows maximum feedback
from each respondent. This, however, was not always possible given time constraints
and wishes from the respondents. The disadvantages of this were that respondents
may have influenced each others responses, that they felt less free to express their
views, and that they had less time to voice their opinions. A benefit of this was that
some respondents remembered things as a result of what the other respondent
mentioned.

4.5 Survey questions

The main aim of the survey was to gather as much information on the topic. For this
purpose the survey made use of open questions. Open questions have the advantage
of capturing ideas not thought of by the researcher. However, given that this also could
result in an unpredictable number of answers, a noticed disadvantage of such an
approach clearly was that the processing of responses became more complicated.

In total seven main guiding questions were prepared in such a way that they could be
used for the printed questionnaires as well as the personal interviews, and this for a
variety of types of sites. The questions also provided a focus for observations at events
and activities. A number of questions could be seen as double questions, something
that is preferably avoided in questionnaires, but because the main technique used for
the data gathering was interviews, some double questions were retained. The double
questions enabled the interviewer to expand on certain points during an interview. The questions were also designed so that respondents would feel that they were given an opportunity to express their views when they may not yet have had a chance to do so. An example of the questionnaire form can be found in Appendix 2. The respondents were asked the following seven questions.

**Question 1:** Many elements of the site’s appearance were created after the Second World War. What do you believe are the important features and aspects and why do you believe that they are important?

**Question 2:** Do you feel that there is a difference between the significance and value of the post-1945 elements and landscape architecture of the site, and that of the pre-war, and why?

**Question 3:** Many people have a low opinion about landscape architecture created after the Second World War. Why do you think this perception exists and what is your opinion?

**Question 4:** What problems do you see on site regarding its conservation and why do you believe that these problems exist, and what do you feel should be done?

**Question 5:** Based on importance of the site’s elements created after the Second World War, do you feel that there are sufficient means in place to safeguard these post-1945 elements, and what else should be done and why?

**Question 6:** What should be taken into consideration when formulating the future policy for the site? On what should decisions be based?

**Question 7:** What and who is driving the decisions regarding the future policy for the site, who should be involved, and how did or do you participate in the decisions, or how could you be involved?
4.6 Survey themes

The questions were arranged in such an order so that they would easily facilitate responses, with a relative easy first question about the specific site and that would help to set the context for the next questions. The questions were prepared to result in responses on six key themes:

**Significance and values of sites:** Questions 1 and 2 were included to collect the respondent’s opinion about what they see as being the significance of the site. It also explored differences in opinions regarding the values of pre-war and post-war sites, or features of a particular site.

**Opinions about recent landscape architecture:** Question 3 evoked answers about the respondent’s opinion about landscape architecture created in the recent past.

**Conservation concerns and problems:** Questions 4 and 6 both tried to gather the respondent’s opinions about the main problems for the site’s long-term conservation.

**Means for conservation:** Through Question 5 opinions and information could be gathered regarding means that are available (or not) for the conservation of sites.

**Drivers in the decision process:** The first part of Question 7 explored opinions about what is, or should be driving decisions about the conservation of sites.

**People involved:** Question 7 also explored opinions about who is at present involved in the conservation of the site, and who should be involved.

4.7 Approval Ethics Committee

The research involved the collection of data directly from people and to meet the ethical requirements of the case study surveys an application for formal approval was made to the De Montfort University’s Faculty Human Research Committee, which reports to the University Human Research Ethics Committee. Formal approval to proceed with the survey was received. Given the fact that interview techniques were used and specific groups of people were targeted for responses, anonymous data collection techniques could not be used by the investigator. Of key importance is
however that all collected data is not made public. To retain anonymity of respondents in the thesis a reference number has been used for each respondent. Where respondent data was requested by the investigator this was not as a primary research purpose but to permit the responses to be analysed in terms of the categories of people who hold these views.

4.8 Data analysis method

Responses from interviews and questionnaires were written up in a standard response sheet template. This response sheet grouped all answers for each respondent individually under the main questions of the survey. The response sheets also contained information to indicate to which case study site the response related and to which target group the respondent belonged. At this stage each respondent was allocated an anonymous reference number.

The response sheet was used to make the process of analysis of the qualitative data easier. The typing up and transferring of the responses and interviews to the response sheets already yielded a first opportunity to analyse responses. The full analysis could not be planned in advance as a large and unpredictable number of possible answers was expected to the open questions. The questions had though been prepared in such a way that the gathered data would be as cross-comparable as possible.

The final in-depth analysis was as expected a time-consuming task given the use of open-ended questions. With the standard response sheets available each individual response was analysed to see what key points or problems were raised. These were grouped under recurring themes. The key themes will be summed up in Chapter Eight in a descriptive and narrative way and in qualitative terms. Some responses included data about the site history and evolution, and while collecting such data was not the main purpose of the survey, part of this data will contribute to the conclusions and hypothesis.

Some quantitative outcomes will be used to illustrate some outcomes. During the analysis of the responses it became clear that some useful quantitative data resulted from the surveys. It was decided to include some of this data and statistical information
in the summary of the characteristics of the respondents, the responses by sites, themes and issues.

4.9 Selection of case study sites

Seven main criteria were used to select the case study sites: Age, location, listing, typology, style, designers, and management.

**Age:** The first criteria for selection was the age of the site. Only sites built after 1945 or containing a key phase of development from the post-1945 period were considered for selection. Of the eleven case study sites Bannockburn Battlefield Heritage Centre, Dunbar’s Close Garden, Falkland Palace Garden, Portrack and Stirling University had post-1945 development layers created in existing designed landscapes. For these sites the conservation issues of the creation of new landscape design in historic settings arises.

**Location:** A second criteria was that the sites were located in the United Kingdom and relatively accessible. Reasons for this were that the study’s main focus is on the United Kingdom context, and that for the purpose of the interviews and questionnaires sites and involved individuals had to be visited. For this reason all but one case study site, the Gibberd Garden, are in Scotland, the place of the investigator’s residence at the time of the research.

**Listing:** A third selection criteria was to include a number of sites that featured on the official government register or inventory. Little Sparta and Falkland Palace Garden both featured on the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes of Historic Scotland (2008e), while The Gibberd Garden is included on the Register of Parks and Gardens of English Heritage (2008b). The designed landscape aspects of Bannockburn Battlefield Heritage Centre does not feature on Historic Scotland’s Register, but the key built structures of the ‘...formalised architectural and landscape re-definition of the battle-site...’ (Historic Scotland, 2004) acquired statutory listing by Historic Scotland in 2004.
Typology: A fourth criteria was to ascertain that sites would represent a diversity of types of designed landscapes. The typologies of the sites have been included in Table 4.1 which gives an overview of all case study sites.

Style: The fifth criteria was to include sites from diverse stylistic periods. This was also done with changing opinions about trends and fashions in mind and to study variations in criticism or appreciation for certain styles. Stylistically several sites that have designs which were strongly influenced by the Modernist fashion were selected, including Bannockburn Heritage Memorial Site, the Gibberd Garden, Cumbernauld New Town, and Scottish Widows. The Prince of Wales’s spoke about ‘...the sheer, unadulterated ugliness and mediocrity of public and commercial buildings, and of housing estates, not to mention the dreariness and heartlessness of so much urban planning....’ (HRH The Prince of Wales, 1989). This criticism of works from that design era illustrate why it is of interest to compare opinions between stylistic fashions. Portrack and Little Sparta are of other stylistic influence and can be described as exponents of the Post-Modernist style, while the developments studied at Falkland Palace Garden, Dunbar’s Close Garden, Suntrap Garden and Stirling University are recent designs but building on traditional design language.

Designers: The sixth criteria that influenced the selection of the sites was to include sites that were developed by known designers or artists, some of them internationally renowned, and including landscape architects as well as architects. In the case of the Bannockburn Battlefield Heritage Site, Stirling University and Suntrap Garden some of the buildings were designed by renowned architects. Table 4.1 includes the names of key designers and artists. One thinking behind this was that if problems with the conservation existed at sites that were designed by known designers, most certainly problems would exist at sites designed by lesser known designers.

Management: A seventh criteria was that sites had to represent different types of management set-ups. Portrack is still owned and managed by the family, while Little Sparta, the Gibberd Garden and Dunbar’s Close are now managed through trusts. Falkland Palace Garden and the Bannockburn Battlefield Heritage Site are managed by the National Trust of Scotland. Scottish Widows is company owned and Stirling University is obviously run as an educational institute. While Suntrap Garden is part
owned by the National Trust for Scotland it is managed by Oatridge College as a
gardeners training centre. Cumbernauld New town is managed by a local authority.

The outcome was that eleven case study sites were selected. Table 4.1 gives an
overview of these sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Significant Designers</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Landscape Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bannockburn Battlefield</td>
<td>Frederic Stevenson, Sir Robert Matthew, Eric Robson, Frank Clark</td>
<td>1963-65</td>
<td>Military, public amenity, conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbernauld New Town</td>
<td>Bill Gillespie a.o.</td>
<td>1956-72</td>
<td>Domestic, public amenity, commercial, industrial, transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar’s Close Garden</td>
<td>Seamos Filor</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Public amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkland Palace Garden</td>
<td>Percy Cane</td>
<td>1947-52</td>
<td>Domestic, conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>Sir Frederick Gibberd</td>
<td>1956-84</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Sutherland</td>
<td>Peter Womersley, Bernat Klein</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>Ian Hamilton Finlay</td>
<td>1966-2006</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>Charles Jencks, Maggie Keswick</td>
<td>Since 1990</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Widows</td>
<td>Dame Sylvia Crowe, Sir Basil Spence, Glover and Ferguson</td>
<td>1972-76</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling University</td>
<td>Sir Robert Matthew, Johnson-Marshall and partners</td>
<td>1968-73</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suntrap Garden</td>
<td>George Boyd Anderson, Sir Robert Matthew</td>
<td>Since 1950s</td>
<td>Domestic, institutional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Four: Methodology

4.10 Selection of respondents

As mentioned, the aim of the case study surveys was to collect views from the category of stakeholders including people directly involved in the maintenance and management of sites, and from the wider public and visitors. To facilitate this a number of targeted respondents groups was used.

4.10.1 Targeted respondents groups for the case study sites

For the purpose of the study six targeted respondents groups were used for the case study sites. Each respondent can be classified in one of these groups. The approach does assist in establishing what issues and views exist, and who is having them. This understanding provides a context to knowing what approaches and actions needed to be developed and for whom. Selection of respondents occurred by studying literature about the case study sites to yield potential interviewees, contacting sites, random selection of visitors and local residents, and as mentioning the snowballing method. Due to respondents’ relationships to the sites, there would obviously be a degree of subjectivity in their responses. The six targeted respondents groups are listed in Table 4.2 together with the number of respondents per group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Contacted respondents by Group</th>
<th>% of total contacted respondents</th>
<th>Completed responses by Group</th>
<th>% of completed responses by Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Site management, staff, owners</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.82</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Local community</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Schools, academics, students</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B General public, visitors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Conservation professionals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Designers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.10.2 Age groups

The survey also aimed to collect responses from a diverse range of age groups. The number and percentages of respondents by age group are illustrated in Table 4.3. The overview shows that there was a good overall spread of age groups with the majority of responses (58.25 per cent) coming from people between thirty and fifty years of age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>% of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10.3 Targeted number of surveys

Given that a qualitative investigation method was used, the number of samples was less important than it would be if the main focus was quantitative data. With a quantitative survey the margin of error is important but this is less applicable to a qualitative survey (Creswell, 2003). What is most important in a qualitative survey is that the sample is large enough to ensure a wide variety of answers. On the other hand, and especially when using open questions, the survey should also not be too large to avoid an impossible task of analysing the qualitative data. Quantitative surveys with twenty to thirty replies are often seen as large enough (Creswell, 2003), but given the subject matter and the fact that responses for several diverse sites needed to be gathered, over fifty replies were the target. In the end over 103 returns were received which was seen as a success.
4.11 Total number of responses

At the start of the survey the aim was to gather a minimum of fifty interview or questionnaire responses in total. To achieve this aim a total of 146 respondents were contacted (Table 4.4), of which eighty-two were mailed a questionnaire form by post or e-mail, and with sixty-four respondents interviews were arranged. This means was that 56.16 per cent received the questionnaire by mail, and 43.84 per cent were asked the questions in interviews.

From this total of 146 contacted respondents, 103 returns or responses were received. The received responses represented a return of 70.55 per cent, which was seen as a success, given that it was twice the number of returns that had initially been expected. The reasons for the 70.55 per cent response rate can be attributed to the fact that my job title of Head of Gardens at the National Trust for Scotland must have influenced the response rate of people who were contacted, and apart from visitors and the wider public most respondents have an involvement in the site’s management or maintenance, which means the respondents have an interest in the site.

The sixty-four interviews that were conducted represent 62.14 per cent of the total responses. All interviews resulted in useful information, but the disadvantage of the interviews was that they were more time consuming for the researcher. An advantage was that responses were more extensive in the interviews, in comparison to the returned questionnaire forms, where respondents at times kept their responses brief.

The thirty-nine responses that were received from replies from posted or e-mailed questionnaires represent 37.86 per cent of the 103 completed responses. Franked envelopes with the return address were provided in the posted questionnaires and some responses were followed up by a short telephone call to clarify certain points further. An overall conclusion was that the number of responses was sufficient for the scope of the research.

The initial target was that about 50 per cent of the responses would be from posted questionnaires, and about 50 per cent from conducted interviews. Given the snowballing method of contacting respondents, and the fact that it is never certain how many people that are mailed questionnaires will return the survey, the result was that
62.14 per cent of the total responses were from interviews, and 37.86 per cent from posted questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.4: Statistical conclusions of the responses to the surveys.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents contacted:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of questionnaires posted (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of interviews conducted (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents contacted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Returns by respondents:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total returns of 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total returns of from posted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of 103 returns, total from posted questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of 103 returns, total from interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The full lists of respondents is included as Table 4.5 in Appendix 3. It lists the 103 respondents with the reference number that was allocated to each respondent. For the purposes of the study, the capital letter of the reference numbers for the respondents refers to the category of targeted respondents groups as listed in Table 4.2. Each respondent was asked the same series of questions but in relation to one particular site. The name of the case study site for which the respondents replied is also included in the table. The table also gives a summary of the social and education backgrounds of the respondents. For this purpose age, gender, occupation and nationality are listed.

**4.12 Number of respondents for each case study site**

An analysis of the respondents by case study site is given in Table 4.6. From the table it is clear that the number of respondents varied much for each site. The low number of contacted respondents at Dunbar’s Close, High Sutherland, Scottish Widows and Stirling University is a result of the fact that at these sites the owners or those responsible for the management of the site were less interested in participating in the surveys. As a consequence it was decided at a stage in the survey to not pursue additional respondents. In contrast to these sites the high number of respondents at some sites reflect the enthusiasm of people related to these sites or members of the
wider public, in participating in the survey. High respondent rates may also owe to the number of interviews conducted at these sites and the success rate with interviews.

Table 4.6: Response rate by Case Study Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Site</th>
<th>Contacted respondents</th>
<th>Completed responses</th>
<th>% Completed responses per site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bannockburn Battlefield</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbernauld New Town</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar's Close Garden</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkland Palace Garden</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Sutherland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Widows</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suntrap Garden</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13 Total number of items mentioned in the responses

By going over each individual response sheet and by grouping issues that where raised in the replies, a number of key topics and issues started to emerge. The next step was to group all topics and issues in a structured and logical way. For example, when a respondent spoke about shortage of money and facilities, then this was noted as an item that was raised as a conservation concern or problem. In total 807 individual items were mentioned in the 103 completed questionnaires or interviews. This is an average of about eight items per respondent. Many concerns were repeated by different respondents and it was as important to see how many people raised the same concerns, and also the variety of concerns that were raised. The number of concerns or items mentioned were added up and grouped under the key themes of the questions and under categories of problems.
4.14 Responses by main themes

As mentioned above, under the explanation behind the survey questions, all questions gathered opinions from a variety of people involved in the conservation of the case study sites, and from the wider public. The questions were prepared in such a way that they would result in responses relating to six key themes. Grouping responses under main themes and categories was necessary to be able to arrive at structured conclusions. The six main themes are:

- Significance and values of sites (Questions 1 and 2)
- Opinions about recent landscape architecture (Question 3)
- Conservation concerns and problems (Questions 4 and 6)
- Means for conservation (Question 5)
- Drivers in the decision process (Question 7)
- People involved (Question 7)

The results of the number of responses that were received that related to each of these themes can be seen in Table 4.7. For statistical purposes the responses given that related to opinions, problems, means, drivers and people were counted. These responses added up to a total of 807 items that were raised in responses. A total of 43.87 per cent of these related to conservation concerns and problems. Two other areas received each about 20 per cent of the responses; the themes on opinions about recent landscape architecture, and people that should be involved in the conservation of sites. Other themes received between about 5 to 10 percent of the answers only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7: Responses by main themes.</th>
<th>Number of different answers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions about recent landscape architecture</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>20.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation concerns and problems</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>43.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers in the decision process</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means for conservation</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People involved</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>19.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total items in returns:</strong></td>
<td><strong>807</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons for this variance include that people apparently found it easier to respond to certain questions. They seemed to also find it easier to mention what problems they see or encounter at the site, or felt that it was important to use the opportunity to raise concerns. People also possibly had less of an understanding or in-sight about certain aspects of the site’s management, such as who the people were that were involved, or should be involved in the management and decision process. Similarly respondents at times also were less certain about the means and resources available at sites for its management. The fact that several respondents were visitors and members of the wider public, which do logically not have full in-sight into such information, also influenced the number of responses for the themes.

4.15 Responses by categories of issues

From the analysis of the responses it became clear that the issues raised in relation to designed landscapes of the recent past and their conservation under the six main themes of the questionnaire could be grouped under ten main categories that illustrate the areas of concern. These categories are listed in Table 4.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.8: Main categories of issues raised in the case study survey.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These ten categories were felt to sum up the overarching areas of concerns, which came up under each of the main themes of Table 4.7. The advantage of using the same categories for each theme is that results are cross-comparable. An overview of the number of responses for each theme and category is given in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: Number of replies by categories of issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Themes:</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>Key problems</th>
<th>Drivers in the conservation process</th>
<th>People Involved</th>
<th>Means for conservation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categories of issues:</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Awareness &amp; recognition</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48.52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Management &amp; maintenance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Finance &amp; budgets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Materials &amp; design</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Planning &amp; development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29.94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Involvement &amp; people</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Legal protection &amp; politics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Social problems &amp; vandalism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Marketing &amp; commercialisation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Education, enjoyment, interpretation, &amp; access</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>354</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on which main theme the questions inquired about, certain categories of issues received more responses. Some of the higher response rates give an indication of what people see as some of their main areas of concern. For example, issues that relate to finance and budgets received overall 9.05 per cent of all responses, but within all responses in the category of finance, the need for appropriate means for conservation accounted for 29.03 per cent of the responses. Issues that related to awareness and opinions about landscape architecture of the recent past received overall 11.90 per cent of all responses. Within this category 48.52 per cent of the responses related to how a lack of awareness and recognition influences people’s
opinions of landscapes of the recent past. This was the third most frequently mentioned topic, with eighty-two items. Materials and designs from the post war era were a frequently mentioned concern, with 29.59 per cent of the responses under this category relating to how design and materials influence people’s opinions of landscapes of the recent past. Another high response rate occurred in the category of planning and development with 19.35 per cent of the responses in this category relating to the need for appropriate means to undertake this. The same category of planning and development received 30.56 per cent of the responses under the theme of drivers in the conservation process, indicating that respondents see this as a major area of concern. It was to be expected that the survey would confirm that planning would come up high, as it is an essential part of the conservation process. That it also came up as a key problem, and that the means to implement planning are lacking, highlights the importance of addressing this issue, in order to move forward with the conservation of landscape architecture of the recent past. Of significance is also that legal protection and listing was frequently mentioned, with an overall response rate of 4.58 per cent. Noteworthy is that 16.67 per cent of the responses in this category related to its role as a driver in the conservation process.

4.16 Experiences during field work

The experiences during field work as part of the case studies are most important to understand the findings. Mostly the experiences were positive but there were a number of negative experiences. The most positive experiences relate to the structured interviews. In particular the interviews with staff involved at the case study sites were most fruitful as they provided the most specific ‘bottom-up’ type of information. Staff are logically very engaged and enthused about the site. In addition the interviews with conservation professionals and designers who dealt with some of the management questions and forward looking visions were very useful. Once the structured interviews were arranged they were relatively straightforward. All interviews were conducted at a familiar location and most convenient location for the interviewee with the aim to limit the time they had to dedicate to it and allow them to be as relaxed as possible.

The interviews varied between thirty minutes and one and a half hour. The questions of the questionnaire were followed with answers given on the spot. Most of the interviews were recorded with a digital voice recorder, with the permission of the interviewee. For
staff involved at sites the interviews were conducted on site during office hours between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm. Staff were in general enthusiastic about the research and given the permission to spend the time on the interviews. Where the site had a property manager prior approval was requested from this person to interview the staff. This was for example the case at sites of the National Trust for Scotland who work with property managers.

Interviews with the wider public and visitors took place in some circumstances at the sites, while in several occasions after office hours or in weekends and away from the site, mostly at the interviewee’s residences. For example when through recommendation or a snowballing effect potential respondents were pointed out these were contacted by writing with a request for an interview. Interviews in weekends and at interviewees’ residences provided a relaxed environment with no time constraints associated with their work. These resulted in some of the most useful responses with very detailed information.

In some cases the interviewees also provided additional documentation or as in the case with some design professionals they illustrated their responses with material such as plans or reports. This was also encouraged by the fact that the circulated questionnaire form also mentioned a request to add any other relevant documentation. Several respondents who completed a questionnaire by mail did include additional documentation such as historical information or press articles.

The willingness for sites to partake in the survey was also in most cases made easier by the professional occupation of the investigator. In all cases but one the owner, property manager or managing organisation of the site was contacted. This was not the case for Stirling University where only students and visitors were contacted. In most cases a response and willingness to participate was received. Only in one case the owner did not see the suitability of the site within the context of the research. Similarly, responses from City Councils were difficult to obtain. This may have related to some suspicion from councils about the purposes of a research and their unfamiliarity with such research. When a response was received from a Council Authority they were mostly brief, indicating that the person responsible did not appear to be interested in dedicating time to a response. This was also experienced with a private garden whose
owner had offered to arrange an interview but failed to do so. Nevertheless several useful respondents were gathered for this case study site.

The unstructured interviews were obviously less easy to organise and were performed in various circumstances. Such interviews were not based on pre-arranged meetings and were based on door-to-door calls in local neighbourhoods, including businesses, or interviews with locals on the streets. They occurred during office hours between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm. In such cases no recording device was used and only handwritten notes were made at the time of interview. The experiences with these interviews were positive though and the investigator was surprised with how interested some respondents were in the case study site and the survey. This related to the fact that often, locals do not feel that they get consulted enough or involved in some of these sites and generally appreciated the fact that someone came to speak to them about the site. When requested several people were happy to make some time for an interview at their house. These unstructured interviews were kept as short as possible and ranged between fifteen minutes and half an hour.

In most cases each mailed questionnaire or request for an interview was followed up once. If this resulted in a non-response, than a response was not pursued further. To increase the response rate of the questionnaires a stamped envelope was included in the mailing. Respondents also were given the opportunity to respond in any written format including e-mail. The stamped envelope was used in several instances and did appear to have helped to encourage responses. Thirty-nine or less than 50% of the mailed questionnaires were returned, making up only just over one-third of all completed responses. In a few cases the respondents completed a mailed questionnaire and offered to follow this up with an interview or a telephone conversation. In total sixty-four members of the public were interviewed.

### 4.17 Conclusions

This chapter has identified the qualitative methodology as most appropriate for our research. Between-method triangulation was selected as the investigation method, which will combine theory triangulation through the use of additional review of literature and records, with data triangulation using case study method. In Chapters Five, Six and Seven the perspective of the wider context will be further investigated through data
triangulation to validate and cross-compare the findings of Chapter Two. This includes a study of the ongoing disfigurement of sites, the current status of inventories, and roles and initiatives of stakeholders including: agency or government organisations; charitable trusts and voluntary organisations; enterprises and consultants; training and educational institutions; and archives.

Chapter Eight will investigate the site-specific context using the case study method, and data triangulation, and look closer at the people involved in the day to day management of the site and involvement of the wider public and visitors. In doing so the case studies further validate findings and provide data relating to aspects which are not sufficiently covered in current literature. As explained, questionnaire and interview techniques are used for the case study surveys. A protocol was established to review and gather the responses and for the data-analysis and to overcome the disadvantages of the case study method.

A general conclusion is that the case study survey was very successful with twice as many respondents having participated than expected. It was clear that the snowballing technique was vital in achieving this high response rate. While the number of responses for each site varies, the survey as a whole presents a good number of responses for each targeted respondent group. With 103 respondents participating and over 800 items being raised under a wide range of themes of concerns and problems, the survey provides valuable new qualitative data. Each of these concerns or problems will be described in Chapter Eight using the responses from the case study surveys. As part of the analysis of the responses, the findings from the literature review and case studies will be cross-examined leading to a final hypothesis and recommendations for future action, which will be summarised in the conclusions in Chapter Nine.
CHAPTER FIVE

5 THE CONTINUING DESTRUCTION AND DISFIGUREMENT OF SIGNIFICANT SITES

5.1 Introduction

Chapters Two and Three illustrated that in principle policy frameworks and conservation philosophies are in place to facilitate the protection of significant heritage, including designed landscapes. In reality, however, it appears that serious threats to sites remain an ongoing concern. It is then no surprise that the need for measures to address the impact of poor management and maintenance of significant sites has been mentioned in many of the existing recommendations that were reviewed in Chapter Two. Already in the DOCOMOMO Eindhoven Statement from 1990 (DOCOMOMO International, 1990) the need to ‘…oppose destruction and disfigurement of significant works of the modern movement…’ was highlighted. At the Preserving the Recent Past Conference in 1995, Shiffer (1995) pleaded again for conservation treatments instead of the removal and destruction of entities. In the ICOMOS recommendations on the protection of Twentieth Century Heritage (ICOMOS, 1995) the importance of encouraging restoration work with respect to aesthetic qualities was also encouraged, and more recently the Moscow Declaration on the preservation of the Twentieth Century Cultural Heritage by ICOMOS Russia (2006) highlighted the need to safeguard, protect and prevent sites from being damaged. The Moscow Declaration also demanded further investigations on character of adaptive reuse and innovative conservation approaches. The Wave Hill Charter was a first recommendation with a specific focus on preserving Modern landscape architecture. It demanded the development of a better stewardship ethos for treatment and management (Birnbaum et al., 2004). From the existing recommendations it is also clear that adherence to established conservation methods and principles, survey methods, analysis and evaluation of sites, and record keeping and monitoring are crucial for successful conservation practice (National Trust for Scotland, 2003b).
The following overview gives examples of ongoing impacts and threats. Examples will be given under three levels of impact.

1. Physical neglect and poor maintenance of sites
2. Disfigurement of sites
3. Destruction of sites

5.2 Physical neglect and poor maintenance of sites

Designed landscapes are living and changing entities or as Russell described ‘…the essential nature of nature is change…’ (Russell, 1999). This implies that designed landscapes require ongoing maintenance and consistency in approaches. Maintenance is also key to achieving the intended design. It may take many years before a designed landscape becomes what its designer envisioned. A failure to see through the intended shaping of a landscape can drastically affect the appearance of a site and its appreciation by the public and users. For example at the Lincoln Centre in New York, Dan Kiley, the designer of the original landscaping, pointed out that the plane trees needed to have their tops clipped in order to achieve the intended horizontal effect (Fig. 14). Kinley’s recommendations were though ignored by the Department of Parks and Gardens (Smith, 1999).

Designers always highlight the importance of maintenance. In a 1948 article on design and maintenance of new town landscapes Thomson (1948) wrote about the importance of maintenance to keep new landscapes relevant for society and to ascertain their completion, appreciation and survival. Thomson rightly believed that ‘...a whole-hearted and efficient policy of maintenance commands respect...’ (Thomson, 1948). George Hazelrigg pointed out that were maintenance slips, sites easily fall into disrepair with the aesthetics and function being the casualties. In such circumstances ‘...works of art died, stories went untold, and history was lost....’ (Hazelrigg, 2003). Hazelrigg concludes that ‘...most modern landscapes that have suffered decline, if not destruction, have had a common ingredient: physical neglect...’ (Hazelrigg, 2003).
Fig. 14: Landscaping at the Lincoln Centre, New York, by Dan Kiley, 1960 (Author’s photograph).

The sad truth is that this is all too often the case for significant designed landscapes of the recent past. The study found several examples in the United Kingdom and internationally. Many iconic designed landscapes from the recent past are illustrated as well maintained in publications but when site visits are conducted, the reality is often one of sad neglect. A visit to the Commonwealth Institute in London, a site on English Heritage’s Register of Historic Parks and Gardens and designed by Dame Sylvia Crowe (English Heritage, 2003b) showed neglect and poor maintenance in 2006 (Fig. 15 and Fig. 16). Walls, pebble paving and water edges required significant repairs. Around that date the media also spoke about the Commonwealth Institute buildings being at risk of demolition (Twentieth Century Society, 2004). In cases like this, the neglect of landscaping may enhance the risk of uninformed decisions and ignorance of the significance of the place.
Fig. 15: Dereliction of the landscaping of the Commonwealth Institute in London. A 1958 building commission for the architectural firm of Sir Robert Matthew, Johnson-Marshall & Partners (RMJM), with landscape design by Dame Sylvia Crowe (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 16: Urgent need of repairs of the landscaping of the Commonwealth Institute in London in 2006 (Author’s photograph).
Several visits to sites abroad indicated similar problems. The iconic gardens and parks designed by Roberto Burle Marx in Brazil look in full glory in many books on Burle Marx (Montero, 2000) or Modern gardens (Brown, 2000). Burle Marx’ trademark ‘wavy lawn’ at the Museum of Modern Art in the Parque do Flamengo in Rio de Janeiro is however losing its detail (Fig. 17). The wavy lawn is seen as a masterpiece of landscape architecture, a piece of art in its own right. It is ironic that the feature is part of the landscaping around a Museum of Modern Art, an institute that should be the foremost champion of such works.

![Image of wavy lawn](image.jpg)

**Fig. 17:** Loss of detail in the ‘wavy lawn’ at the Museum of Modern Art in the Parque do Flamengo in Rio de Janeiro, designed by Roberto Burle Marx (Author’s photograph).

### 5.3 Inappropriate disfigurements of sites

Historic landscapes are records of the constant changes that have taken place over time and landscape conservation has no intention of unnecessarily obstructing development or change, as this is essential to keep sites relevant within an evolving society. The conservation process aims to guide this process ‘...in a way which identifies and respects what is cherished within the landscape, maintaining an integrity between past, present and future....’ (Macinnes, 1996). If this process is not controlled
it might lead to the loss of all regional and local characteristics (National Trust, 2000a). The pressure of development on historic landscapes should therefore be studied and dealt with properly or the last remains of cultural identity may slip away forever (Roebuck and Davison, 1994).

Design and conservation specialists accept that it is impossible to conserve everything and that a degree of change is needed (Jones, 1993). For example Laurie Olin agrees that we do not always need to slavishly stick to the historic design, and that not all sites are equal. He says that we must acknowledge that famous designers at times ‘...do some great work, not-so-great work and terrible work...’ (Leigh Brown, 2003). Lawrence Halprin acknowledged that modifications to his designs are appropriate at times and that for each case there are different solutions. He also clarified that he does not view his designs as static (Leigh Brown, 2003). Even at times a reinterpretation of a site may be appropriate, as was successfully done at the popular Bryant Park in Manhattan, New York (Leigh Brown 2003). Fred Kent described this by saying that a space has to be flexible and evolve and grow ‘...as a civic gathering place for the community....’ (Gragg, 2003).

It is worrying that ‘...unfortunately, neglect and inappropriate development have put important cultural landscapes alarmingly at risk...’ (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2003b). Birnbaum in 1999 drew attention to the fact that he had noticed that in recent years substantial numbers of landscapes from the recent past had been put more and more at risk or been altered substantially (Birnbaum, 1999a). Halprin also spoke out in 2003 saying that many important landscape improvements especially since the Second World War in our cities are coming under attack by civic agencies and developers (Halprin, 2003). Halprin’s outcry must be seen as a warning against the destruction of plazas and parks to accommodate developments. He believes that land set aside for open space is particularly vulnerable. Olin agrees that ‘...landscape is still seen as no more than a building site....’ (Birnbaum, 2003c). Too often the environmental and cultural ramifications of decisions are ignored.

Many examples can be found where changes to landscapes of the recent past have been controversial and ‘...the argument for acquiescing to demolish is often based simply on the fact that “change is inevitable and we just have to put up with it”....’ (Halprin, 2004). Olin’s description of the changes to the Museum of Modern Art
(MOMA) sculpture garden in New York is a sad illustration of such ongoing practices as he said that ‘…it would be hard to imagine a more clumsy or destructive set of architectural gestures in what was once one of the most sophisticated, intimate and quiet spaces in New York or urban America…’ (Olin, 1997). The Museum of Modern Art sculpture garden was recognised as an architectural masterpiece and an integral part of the museum’s exhibition when designed in 1953 by Philip Johnson with James Fanning as landscape consultant (Olin, 1997). Robert Zion assisted Johnson as landscape consultant when in 1964 expansions were made to the building. It was an example of how to involve the original architect in necessary developments. Critics agreed that their adaptations fitted brilliantly with the original scheme and even added value. In contrast, in 1984 further additions to the museum buildings have been less well received. Johnson was again asked to be the architect but Cesar Pelli was commissioned to carry out the work. Pelli’s changes have been criticised for ignoring the aesthetics of Johnson’s concept and in particular the new restaurant building seemed to crush the garden’s delicate composition. Olin’s disappointment with the scheme was already described above. Olin felt that the alterations ‘…not only truncated the garden but also encroached on it in several ways…’ (Olin, 1997). As a result the character, meaning, function and quality has changed completely and the garden no longer feels as an integral part of the museum design. He is of the opinion that a complete destruction of Johnson’s masterpiece has been achieved (Olin, 1997).

Examples are plenty, such as the already mentioned case of the landscaping around the Lincoln Centre in Manhattan, New York, designed by Dan Kiley (Fig. 14). It illustrates the impacts of inappropriate alterations to planting schemes on a design and how re-evaluation of poor maintenance and alterations is needed to save some sites from long term destruction (Smith, 1999). The plantings of four plane trees in a square in the raised planters at the Lincoln Centre was changed to single ornamental pear trees. The flowering Japanese Azaleas in the planters were changed into old-fashioned bedding plants. It appears that horticulturist working on the project in the 1980s did not recognise the integrity and significance of Kiley’s planting design. The horticulturists said that Kiley’s design always had fundamental shortcomings and made alterations which now have diminished the character of the design and its integrity (Smith, 1999).

Alterations to hard landscaping are another delicate area. In the case of Queen’s Park in Toronto, Ontario, designed by Sasaki Associates and Richard Strong, the uneven
paving of wobbly stones was replaced by a granular base, better suited for maintenance needs, and to Ontario’s climate. Heavy vehicles using snowploughs often chip away corners of the current stones. The designers admitted that when the design was prepared the climate was not sufficiently taken into account (Redlak, 2002), justifying the changes. Even when changes to the hard landscaping are acceptable, the choice of materials remains crucial. Frequently mismatched materials are causing similar poor outcomes as in the case of inappropriate changes to planting. At the Queen’s Park in Toronto mismatching limestone paving had in the past been used for repairs. New replacement of such paving with matching limestone has assured that the changes have restored how the landscaping tied in with the building (Redlak, 2002).

5.4 Destruction of sites

The worst-case scenario occurs where the complete destruction of significant landscapes of the recent past takes place. Before looking at the full destruction of sites the issue of disassembly requires some attention. In some cases landscape designs or part of, have been disassembled and moved. In other cases building in landscapes have the same fate. At times such features are rebuilt in other locations, in other cases not, all with serious implications for the significance and integrity of the site.

The dismantling of the Water Gardens in Harlow New Town has possibly been the most controversial case of a designed landscape of the recent past in the United Kingdom. Sir Frederick Gibberd designed the Water Gardens and they were completed in 1960. The gardens featured on English Heritage’s Register of Historic Gardens and Parks with a Grade II* listing (Rutherford, 2000). A re-development plan for the town centre proposed to dismantle and relocate the gardens. English Heritage opposed this as they felt that this would damage the original concept and setting to such a degree that in effect would be equal to the demolition of the gardens (Duterloo-Morgan, 2002b). The developers went ahead with the relocation and English Heritage removed the Water Gardens from Register. The case raises the question about the power and efficiency of the legislative framework in the United Kingdom. If not even sites that are featuring on a national register can be protected, what measures can than protect non-registered sites? Comparable cases of buildings can be found in the United Kingdom and abroad, and in other disciplines. For example a good example of an iconic building of the recent past that was threatened was the Farnsworth House in Plano, Illinois,
designed by Mies van der Rohe and completed in 1951. This case shows that also in the United States such problems continue to occur. The Farnsworth House is seen as one of the most significant residences built in the United States in the Twentieth Century, only one of three private residences by Mies van der Rohe (Fig. 18), and a pivotal work and international modernist masterpiece (Landmarks Illinois, 2003). The Landmarks Preservation Council of Illinois and the National Trust for Historic Preservation said it would be ‘…an architectural disaster of the first order if it were to be moved from its original location…’ (Landmarks Illinois, 2003). They launched a campaign to buy the house because it had been put on the market to be sold as a piece of art by Sotheby, New York, overlooking the value of the original setting.

Fig. 18: The campaign to save the Farnsworth House in Plano, Illinois, designed by Mies van der Rohe and completed in 1951 (Landmarks Illinois, 2003).

While in the case of relocation elements of the site survive, numerous cases exist of what amounts to the complete destruction of sites. The re-development of the
Waterfront Park in Boston by Craig Halvorson is seen as a failure of redesign (Flint, 2002). The original park has been transformed to such a degree that critics agree that the new design ‘...laid waste to Sasaki Associates’ ground-breaking (1973-76)...’ park (Redlak, 2002). The name change to Christopher Columbus Park only substantiates this (Fig. 19).

Fig. 19: The re-developed Christopher Columbus Park. It caused the destruction and renaming of Sasaki Associates’ Waterfront Park in Boston (Author’s photograph).

Other cases of the destruction of iconic gardens at museum sites are some of the most baffling. Even though Lawrence Halprin had been awarded the National Medal of Arts, the highest honour for artistic excellence in the United States (Birnbaum, 2003c), in 2003 an extension plan of the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond, Virginia, proposed the destruction of his sculpture garden (Fig. 20). George Hazelrigg wrote that ‘...the dead warrant for Halprin’s project has been signed, but the execution has not yet been carried out....’ (Hazelrigg, 2003) as he finds it difficult to grasp that a modernist landscape designed by a nationally acclaimed master that is still in good condition can be destroyed by a museum. The design integrity of the sculpture garden remains intact
and any flaws appear repairable. The expansion and destruction of the garden was in process in 2008 (Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 2008).

Fig. 20: Lawrence Halprin’s iconic sculpture garden at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond, Virginia, was being destroyed for the extension of the museum (Birnbaum, 2003c).

Many conservation and design specialists find it hard to believe that modernist landscape design masterpieces situated at places of international worshipping and promotion of art do not get the protection they deserve, and are not safe due to a lack of appreciation (Hazelrigg, 2003). Birnbaum asks how it is possible that respected museums ‘...entrusted to preserve works of art, intend to destroy masterworks by prominent landscape architects...’ (Birnbaum, 2003a) and compares this to other arts forms when saying that ‘...if a painting or sculpture is purchased, it is safe to assume that it will be respected. A house or landscape, however, may be brought down...’
Olin describes such actions simply as architectural blunders (Olin, 1997).

Fig. 21: Landform from 2002 by Charles Jencks at the Gallery of Modern Art, Edinburgh (Author’s photograph).

It makes people wonder what the future holds for new landscape art pieces at museums such as the Landform from 2002 by Charles Jencks at the Gallery of Modern Art, Edinburgh (Fig. 21) (Grdadolink, 2002) or the work by Ian Hamilton Finlay at the Gallery of Modern Art and the Dean Gallery in Edinburgh (National Galleries of Scotland, 2008). Similarly, how will we treat the new landscaping around the new Scottish Parliament building in Edinburgh by Enric Miralles and the RMJM architects (RMJM, 2008)? There is a real threat that landscapes from the recent past and the present will be gone before they may be appreciated as being significant and historic on the basis of age. Halprin once said in a conversation that as designers we ‘…spend thirty to forty years trying to get our projects built and then the next ten to twenty years trying to make sure that they do not get knocked down…’ (Birnbaum, 1999a). In her article on ‘Underage Landmarks’ Benjamin describes that she finds it ‘…inconceivable that the jewels of modern architecture would be destroyed…..’ (Benjamin, 1988). She worries that through every indiscriminate act of demolition the rich texture of our architectural environment is eroded. Birnbaum calls for a commitment to the landscapes that are part of our everyday lives, even if we take them for granted,
because ‘...if we allow these losses and modifications to continue – unmonitored by the profession and allied communities – we run the risk of erasing a significant chapter of landscape history...’ (Birnbaum, 1999a).

It is because of such threats that some organisations have launched campaigns to save sites. Online web sites with sites at risk or that have been lost have been created and organisations keep repeating that ‘...the constant effort it takes to preserve the heritage of cultural landscapes is everyone’s responsibility...’ (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2003b). Threat of destruction now at times causes serious public outrages on web sites or in the media as such routes are often seen as a last resort. The ongoing case in the United States of the proposed removal of Richard Neutra’s Cyclorama building at Gettysburg has resulted in a noticeable campaign by Mission66 (2008). In Scotland a similar case exactly at the same time, also involved a battlefield site and circular modernist built structure. This case related to the proposed removal of the Rotunda and associated landscape at Bannockburn Heritage Site by the National Trust for Scotland (Fig. 22 and Fig. 25).

Fig. 22: A sketch by Eric Stevenson of the proposal from 1962 for the development of the Bannockburn Heritage site with the Rotunda and visitor facilities (Wemyss, 1962).

This caused DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group to raise the concern to Historic Scotland in 2004 who in response fast tracked its listing (Mackecknie and Metcalf-
Gibson, 2004). The case of Bannockburn was, given the investigator’s work at the National Trust for Scotland, also investigated. In the Appendices a short paper and poster display (Haenraets, 2006) and the contents of a historic landscape survey (Haenraets, 2008) that were developed on the case of Bannockburn, can be found. Bannockburn will also be used later in this research as a site in the case study survey.

Fig. 23: Bannockburn Rotunda in the 1960s (Scott, 1964).
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Fig. 24: Bannockburn Rotunda with interpretive signs in the 1960s (Macpherson, 1964).

Fig. 25: The Robert the Bruce statue and Rotunda at Bannockburn at present (Author’s photograph).
5.5 Conclusions

In the introduction to this chapter it was clarified how several existing recommendations highlight the need for proper conservation and management of significant sites of the recent past. The examples studied in this chapter teach us that there are in practice still many shortcomings. The overview was not intended as a comprehensive study of all sites at risk, which is practically impossible, but aimed to verify the recommendations with ongoing practice. It is clear that examples of good and bad practices in the conservation and protection of sites can be found. The fact that several examples have been given of problems that occur does not mean that this is the case at all sites and neither can be concluded from this overview that poor practice occurs more than good practice.

What must be acknowledged is that in many cases with sites there are ongoing problems and this even though there are a number of protective measures and recommendations in place. It could be noted that practical problems that exist at sites include that some designed landscapes of the recent past are poorly maintained, get damaged by inappropriate alterations, or are under threat of destruction. It is also clear that many significant sites have already been lost.

An important conclusion is that the examples that were given are mostly well-known and significant landscapes, often designed by renowned landscape architects. A concern is that if even for significant sites such problems exist, than this must mean that for lesser-known sites conservation will potentially be even worse or more problematic.

Knowing that a number of recommendations for measures to protect sites exist and that international methodologies and charters are in place for the conservation of significant heritage, the findings from this chapter confirm that we must remain concerned about the apparent failure of the existing systems to protect these sites from ongoing loss and destruction of key aspects of this heritage. The findings of the chapter confirm Birnbaum’s statement that progress was made, but more efforts are required (Birnbaum, 1999a) or as Longstreth said, that lack of recognition for the recent past remains an underlying threat to this valuable heritage (Longstreth, 2004).
CHAPTER SIX

6 THE CURRENT STATUS OF REGISTERS AND INVENTORIES

6.1 Introduction

The findings about ongoing disfigurement and destruction of sites bring up several questions. An important question is to understand better what role official inventories and registers play at present in the conservation of sites. Inventories cannot only provide some protective status to sites but also are essential in understanding what sites exist and are of significance. The importance of knowing what sites exists was highlighted by Longstreth (1995) by saying that we cannot afford not to know what we have. Dingwall and Lambert support this by saying that ‘…you cannot conserve something, if you do not know what to conserve…’ and that ‘…the development of a conservation policy for any part of the national heritage depends on there being identification of the of the resource concerned….’ (Dingwall and Lambert, 1997). With this in mind Longstreth argues that we do not have the luxury of time and points out that there are too many factors, such as population growth and change, that speed up the threat to the recent past. Shiffer supports this argument when saying that ‘…more recent resources are already disappearing too rapidly to afford the luxury of allowing specified periods of time to pass before studying them….’ (Shiffer, 1995).

Marc Trieb commented in 1993 that the story of modern landscape architecture remained largely untold (Trieb, 1993) and this, as Shiffer points out, while we know that ‘…preservation efforts must begin with an understanding of the historical and cultural significance of the resources….’ (Shiffer, 1995). Shiffer adds that it is only with solid scholarship, that the significance of the recent past can be put in historic perspective (Shiffer, 1995) and that we really know what is worthy of preservation.

Ken Smith wrote in 1999 that he believes that the history of recent landscape design is not yet sufficiently well-documented, and that there is a limited theoretical and historical underpinning, and that this is a most important problem that contributes to the lack of
recognition (Smith, 1999). Smith finds that landscape architecture still lacks the depth of research and documentation, which in general is much more underpinned in the field of architecture, where there exists much more critical, theoretical and historical documentation to substantiate the profession (Smith, 1999). Such lack of information and literature was described by Benjamin (1988) as ignorance. Understanding heritage assets in order to deliver proper conservation is a fundamental conservation principle (ICOMOS Australia, 1979) and is a key step in the conservation process (National Trust for Scotland, 2003b).

A most essential tool to assist in understanding what sites exist and what is worthy of preservation are inventories of significant sites. From the literature review of existing recommendations it became clear that one of the suggestions for actions that was repeated frequently is the need for the preparation of inventories and the official listing of designed landscapes of the recent past. The DOCOMOMO Eindhoven Statement from 1990 was an early example of a recommendation that set out goals to ‘identify and promote the recording of the works of the modern movement, including a register, drawings, photographs, archives and other documents’ (DOCOMOMO International, 1990). The recommendation on the protection of the Twentieth Century architectural heritage of the Council of Europe (1991) did also ask for the identification of the Twentieth Century heritage and to prepare systematic inventories. The recommendation focussed on buildings but it can be read with landscapes in mind. It suggested that inventories could consist of national lists that cover all periods, or alternatively special lists that cover one specific period such as Twentieth Century architecture. The recommendation states that:

‘...these lists should be:

- open-ended rather than selective, and amenable to continuous updating, revision and extension in the light of fresh information;
- drawn up without prejudice as to style, type of building, method or period of construction;
- designed, presented and published in such a manner that their content is available to the broadest possible public, in terms of vocabulary used, illustrations and arrangements for distribution;
- compiled where possible so as to take account of survey practices in the different European countries, so as to promote mutual communication and
These recommendations set some clear challenges to member states of the European Union. The general recommendations on the protection of Twentieth Century heritage, agreed by ICOMOS in 1995 (ICOMOS, 1995) again emphasised the need for systematic documentation in all its dimensions and points out that critical choices have to be made to decide which places merit selection. Also in 1995, at the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture Conference, Birnbaum (1999a) included in his suggestions for areas of action the need to pursue nominations to national registers for recent landscape architecture.

In existing literature there is limited documentation available that indicates to what effect the listing of landscapes from the recent past has been effective. For example, it is not clear how many sites have been included on existing registers and inventories. There are though clear indications that shortcomings remain. For instance, the Moscow declaration on the preservation of Twentieth Century cultural heritage (ICOMOS Russia, 2006) which dates from 2006 gives an indication that progress with such inventories has not yet been sufficient, this even though recommendations to prepare such exist since the 1990s. The declaration, prepared with Russian architecture in mind, explains in its introduction that it remains ‘…concerned with the current state of advanced decay, and the level and diversity of threats to many of those world famous properties and monuments….’ (ICOMOS Russia, 2006). The declaration therefore again calls for ‘…Russian authorities to secure Federal heritage listing of the most valuable Twentieth Century monuments….’ (ICOMOS Russia, 2006) and to put forward some of the most outstanding buildings for listing on the UNESCO World Heritage Tentative List (UNESCO World Heritage, 2008e). This declaration raises the issue concerning buildings and not landscapes. For landscapes the situation is most probably even worse as there is not even a declaration that raises similar issues.

To understand the issues better, the following survey results and overviews of existing inventories will assist in establishing which registers are playing important roles and what gaps and shortcomings remain. To arrive at useful conclusions a number of inventories were studied. Good examples of inventories with designed landscapes that are of national significance can be found at governmental institutions such as English
Heritage (2008d) or Historic Scotland (2008b), in the United Kingdom, or the Register of Historic Places of the National Park Service in the United States. In addition, several independent organisations or charities have good examples of registers. The UNESCO World Heritage List (2008f) includes sites that are of universal significance. The database of Parks and Gardens UK (2008d) is an example of an inventory with the aim to compile a comprehensive list for the subject of gardens and parks. The DOCOMOMO International Selection (2008c) has a similar purpose in regard of modern buildings.

To review governmental and non-governmental inventories that feature designed landscapes of the recent past the following initiatives have been studied:

1. Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, English Heritage
2. Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland, Historic Scotland
3. National Register of Historic Places, Department of the Interior, United States
4. DOCOMOMO Registers
5. UNESCO World Heritage List
6. ICOMOS Heritage at Risk Reports
7. Parks and Gardens UK Database
8. World Monuments Fund List of Endangered Sites
9. Other Recent Past Endangered Lists by non-governmental organisations

The analysis includes where feasible the number of sites that feature at present on these inventories and conclusions will highlight existing gaps and shortcomings. The study cannot be comprehensive and include every inventory, but a selection has been made to give a representative reflection of the present situation.

6.2 The Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England

Recognizing that ‘…historic parks and gardens are a fragile and finite resource…’ and that ‘…they can easily be damaged beyond repair or lost forever…’, English Heritage (2008f) was enabled by the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 (English Heritage, 2008f) to compile the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special
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Historic Interest in England. The key purposes of the Register are (English Heritage, 2008f):

- To help safeguard places during management and potential change.
- To assist in recognising the existence of these important sites.
- To assist in increasing awareness of the value of sites by drawing attention to these sites.
- To encourage owners of places, or those that have a role in their conservation, to treat the places with appropriate care.

English Heritage clarifies that although many designed landscapes are seen as of historic value, only those that are sufficiently important and of ‘special historic interest’ will be included on the Register. This does mean that the number of designed landscapes that are included on the Register is therefore a much smaller number than the sites that are of historic value. English Heritage uses an assessment of significance to define special historic interest for sites (English Heritage, 2007b). The Register uses three grade bands to inform the level of significance of a site. Grade II means that such sites are of a sufficiently high level of interest to merit a national designation. Grade II* means sites are of exceptional historic interest (30 per cent of the sites) and Grade I sites are of international importance (10 per cent of the sites) (English Heritage, 2008b).

6.2.1 The establishment of a thirty year rolling rule

Chapter Two explained that in 1987 English Heritage (Twentieth Century Society, 2008a) decided to start using a thirty-year rolling rule for listing of buildings (Page, 1992) and that the first years of listing they were not very successful (Powers, 2008). It was through pressure from amenity groups that English Heritage developed new selection procedures, that included consultation with the public and owners, together with an information campaign. Thematic research of post war architecture across England was commissioned to inform selection by a new Post War Listing Steering Group, after which the group forwarded listing proposals to relevant committees (Powers, 2008). Good progress with listing was made in the 1990s and English Heritage regularly published updates (Kay, 1993) or progress reports (Kay, 1994) on its listing of post war buildings. Their activities focused at that time on ‘defining what we have’ (English Heritage, 1994), through listing. More details about the work of English
Heritage to increase awareness and non-inventory work can also be found in Chapter Seven, under the analysis of roles and initiatives by key stakeholders.

### 6.2.2 Post-1945 sites on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest

When in 1987 the thirty-year rule was introduced by English Heritage for the listing of Buildings, the same rule was applied to the Register of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest (English Heritage, 1993). By 1996 the Register included some 1,200 sites, compared to about 400,000 listed buildings (Dingwall and Lambert, 1997). For England and Scotland it was estimated that the register lists include only about 10% of the significant gardens in any given area (Dingwall and Lambert, 1997). Until about 2000 updates on Register work, published by English Heritage in its Conservation Bulletin (Campbell, 1996), spoke mainly about general topics and registration (McRobbie, 1996). It took until the early 2000s for more focused attention to putting post war landscapes on the Register (Rutherford, 2001a). This came five to ten years later than similar attention in the Conservation Bulletin was given to architecture from the recent past, and the same number of years after the setting up of the English Heritage Post War Listing Steering Group for buildings. The Steering Group had suggested in 1997 that it would be available to liaise closely with the Gardens Register Team at English Heritage on designations of post war gardens and landscapes (Harwood, 1997).

Finally, in 2001 there seemed to be an increasing attention given to post war designed landscapes by English Heritage. This appears to have been triggered by the proposed demolition and relocation of the Water Gardens at Harlow New Town (Fig. 11 and Fig. 12), which in June 2001 was an important agenda item of the English Heritage Historic Parks and Gardens Panel (English Heritage, 2007a). The case of the Water Gardens illustrates the restrictive legal power of the Register. The Water Gardens were designed in 1947 by Sir Frederic Gibberd and were listed as Grade II* by English Heritage (Rutherford, 2000), which means they are of ‘exceptional historic interest’ (English Heritage, 1998b). The Water Gardens significance had been reassessed by English Heritage staff and following recommendations from English Heritage’s Regrading Panel (Tailor, 2001), the listing had been upgraded in 2001 from Grade II to Grade II* (Rutherford, 2001b). By 2001 the threat of demolishment to the Harlow Water Gardens due to development proposals was already a long running issue. Already in
1997 English Heritage was strongly opposed to the proposals from the developer for ‘relocation’ of the gardens, given their listing and significance (Duterloo, 1997). The English Heritage Post War Listing Steering Group supported the Gardens Register team view and also expressed their grave concerns (Harwood, 1997).

As mentioned before, the developers, Wilson Bowden Development Limited, pursued their plans and Harlow Council granted planning consent following recommendations by the Special Regulatory Committee (Shingler, 2001). This while there was strong opposition from English Heritage, amenity societies including the Twentieth Century Society (2002) and the Garden History Society (Lambert, 1997), and the late Lady Gibberd, Sir Frederick’s widow (Rouse, 2001). The planners agreed to relocate the gardens (Rouse, 2001) and rebuilt the gardens as part of the development. English Heritage concluded that the rebuilt Water Gardens are no longer of special historic interest and removed the site from the Register as of 20 February 2003 (Conway, 2003).

The case of the Water Gardens had clearly moved the issue of post war designed landscapes higher onto some English Heritage agendas. The Historic Parks and Gardens Panel (English Heritage, 2007a) continued to keep the protection of post war landscapes on the agenda of their next three meetings, which took place in September and December 2001, and March 2002. After the March meeting post war landscapes disappeared from the Panel’s agenda (English Heritage, 2007a).

In 2002 Duterloo-Morgan (2002a) of English Heritage prepared a draft post-1945 landscapes typology. This typology assisted English Heritage in selecting themes for commissioning research; This research and further developments after 2002 will be described later.

By 2002 twelve of the 1450 sites on the Register were of a post war design (Duterloo-Morgan, 2002b). With post-1945 we mean here that the main phase of development of these sites was after 1945. By 2003 the list had reached fifteen sites, but after the de-listing of Harlow Water Gardens (Conway, 2003) only fourteen sites remained on the Register (English Heritage, 2003b). Table 6.1 gives an overview of these sites.
Table 6.1: Post-1945 sites on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest (English Heritage, 2003b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designer &amp; Date</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>Barbara Hepworth Sculpture Garden</td>
<td>B. Hepworth, 1949-70s</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>Civic Square, Plymouth</td>
<td>G. Jellicoe, 1957-62</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>The House (Gibberd Garden)</td>
<td>F. Gibberd, 1956-84</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>The Commonwealth Institute</td>
<td>S. Crowe, 1960-62</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>The Barbican</td>
<td>Chamberlin, Powell, Bon,</td>
<td>II*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1963-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxon</td>
<td>St Catherine’s College, Oxford</td>
<td>A. Jacobsen, 1960-64</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs</td>
<td>German Cemetery</td>
<td>Diez Brandi, 1967</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Harvey’s Roof Garden, Guildford</td>
<td>G. Jellicoe, 1956-57</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>The Vale, Edgbaston</td>
<td>Mary Mitchell (with Casson and Conder), 1959-60</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Walsall Memorial Gardens</td>
<td>G. Jellicoe, 1952</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>Friarwood Valley Park, Pontefract</td>
<td>R.W. Grubb, 1950s</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambs</td>
<td>American Military Cemetery</td>
<td>Olmstead Bros, 1956</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilts</td>
<td>Queen’s Park, Swindon</td>
<td>Borough of Swindon, 1950s</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Pasmore Pavilion, Peterlee</td>
<td>Victor Pasmore, 1960s</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3 Thematic research to underpin the Register

With conservation heritage from the recent past gaining attention on governments’ agendas in the 1990s, governmental agencies started to research more specific themes within the subject to amass further understanding. English Heritage had a programme of surveys linked to its Post War Listing Steering Group from about 1992 until 2002 (Powers, 2008), and also a programme of research existed to inform work on the Register of Gardens and Parks (English Heritage, 2003a). The research projects that English Heritage ran in the 1990s can be seen in Table 6.2 and are
showing an emphasis on garden themes that relate to sites created before 1945. This emphasis does not shift towards recent past subjects and new types of heritage until after 2000. The studies included only one post war landscapes research theme, the 2003 report by Barbara Simms (2003) on ‘Landscapes of the Post-War Housing Developments’. Simms (2001) had already written on the subject in the London Gardener. The work done in 2002 for English Heritage by Duterloo-Morgan, (2002a) to prepare a draft typology for post war landscapes further informed understanding and could assist in informing other desired areas of thematic research.

### Table 6.2: Thematic research by English Heritage for the Register of Gardens and Parks

(English Heritage, 2003a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Approx. length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks</td>
<td>Peter Vickers and Hilary Taylor</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>Hazel Conway</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>Chris Brooks</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Parks</td>
<td>Chris Taylor</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal Private Open Space</td>
<td>Jane Root</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sawrey Gilpin</td>
<td>Sophieke Piebenga</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Gardens</td>
<td>Susan Campbell</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Gardens</td>
<td>Debois Landscape Survey Group</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Features and Rock Gardens</td>
<td>Susan Schnare</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Town Gardens</td>
<td>David Lambert</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability Brown landscapes around London</td>
<td>Debois Landscape Survey Group</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Squares</td>
<td>Camilla Beresford</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post War Housing Landscapes</td>
<td>Barbara Simms</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>46 +gazeteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighteenth Century Landscapes and Golf Course Development</td>
<td>David Jacques</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.2.4 Heritage Protection Review**

By 2002 things started to shift in the approaches by English Heritage. For example the Post-War Listing Steering Group was disbanded in 2002 (Powers, 2008). Powers
believes that this was possibly due to the success of the buildings listing programme and certainly budgetary shifts. As mentioned in Chapter Two, Powers’ view was that things started to go backwards again (Powers, 2008). What is now clear is that while thematic surveys were still taking place, other questions about the way protection occurred started to surface. We now know that after a first commitment by the government in 2001 to review how the historic environment was being protected (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2001), the government recognised by 2003 that there were shortcomings in the current system of listing (Thurley, 2003). In response a consultation paper on ‘Protecting our Historic Environment: Making the System Work Better’ was launched (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2003). Conclusions were summed up in the report ‘Review of Heritage Protection: The Way Forward’ (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2004). Long-term ambitions were finally made public in the Heritage Protection Review White Paper In 2007 (Department for Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh Assembly Government, 2007). With this the government responded to the public’s call for change and set out the proposals for a simpler and more efficient system.

The review recognised that each designation system, whether for buildings, scheduled monuments, gardens or parks, was recorded and managed separately. Access to information, processes and records also varied greatly. The outcome of the review was that a new single national designation system was proposed for England called the Register of Historic Buildings and Sites of England (Department of Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh Assembly Government, 2007). With this single list the Government aims to improve its documentation, understanding and way of managing sites, but also speed up the system. Such a single list mirrors the approach in the United States with the National Register of Historic Places (National Park Service, 2008d). New legislation will underpin the system and the public will be involved more in designation.

By 2007 the Register included nearly 1587 sites (Department of Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh Assembly Government, 2007) and in August 2008 there were 1597 sites on the Register (Walker, 2008). With the new system not yet implemented, the number of post-1945 sites on the inventory remains at fourteen or less than 1% (Walker, 2008), basically the same fourteen sites listed in Table 6.1. No post-1945 sites have been added since 2003.
6.3 The Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland

When in 1987 English Heritage started to use the thirty-year rolling rule (Page, 1992), this already existed in Scotland for the listing of buildings (Twentieth Century Society, 2008a). The Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland however never had an age restriction which explains why the term 'historic' is neither used in the name of the Inventory (Scottish Natural Heritage, 2005). The Inventory is seen as an invaluable resource and a growing and evolving record of nationally important gardens and designed landscapes. Its entries include details on (Historic Scotland, 2008c):

- Why the site is worth protecting?
- Its location and setting
- Site values
- Site history
- Landscape components

The initial development of the Inventory was done in partnership between Scottish Natural Heritage and Historic Scotland (Land Use Consultants, 1987). The Inventory is now produced and published by Historic Scotland, an agency of the Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affairs Department (SEERAD) (Scottish Government, 2008). The Inventory is seen as an invaluable resource and a record of nationally important gardens and designed landscapes across Scotland and is since 2007 also available online (Historic Scotland, 2007b).
Fig. 26: Little Sparta, created by Ian Hamilton Finlay, in Lanarkshire, Scotland (Author’s photograph).

In 2007 the Inventory listed 386 sites (Historic Scotland, 2007c), while more than 1000 sites had been considered for inclusion (Historic Scotland, 2007a). The Inventory includes five sites designed post-1945 or with significant main phases of design from post-1945, including Little Sparta, in Dunsyre, South Lanarkshire (Fig. 26) and Falkland Palace. Both gardens will be used as case study sites later in the case study survey. Table 6.3 gives an overview of these sites.

Cowhill Tower in Holywood, Dumfries and Galloway, also features as a designed landscape on the Inventory. It was laid out since 1850s and has additional gardens created by the Keswick family since 1950. Portrack, Garden of Cosmic Speculation (Fig. 27), created by Charles Jencks and the late Maggie Keswick since 1990 is also part of this landscape, but was in 2008 not yet included in the listing for Cowhill Tower. The site may potentially be included when Historic Scotland revisits the listings for the Dumfriesshire region.
In 2008 Historic Scotland planned a comprehensive resurvey of the entire Inventory and it was expected that several sites will be removed during this process as it is apparent that several sites do not meet the criteria of national significance (Cairns, 2008). A shortcoming of the Inventory process is that Historic Scotland is not running its listing working group, an issue which was raised by several stakeholders as part of the consultation process of the Historic Environment Policy review by Historic Scotland (2008f).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designer, creators and key dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnhourie Mill, Colvend and Southwick, Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>Created by Miss E.M.H. King and Dr M.R. Paton since 1960.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Sparta (Stoneypath), Dunsyre, South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>Created by the sculptor and poet Ian Hamilton Finlay, since 1967.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Botanic Garden, Kirkmaiden, Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>Part of Logan House designed landscape, developed since Eighteenth Century. In 1969 gifted to the Royal Botanic Gardens Edinburgh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 **The National Register of Historic Places, United States**

The National Register of Historic Places (National Park Service, 2008d) was established in the United States under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and included by 2008 over 80,000 sites (National Park Service, 2008c). Its aim is to include ‘…landmarks of American achievement as well as properties that reflect the everyday lives of ordinary people in communities across the nation….’ (National Park Service, 2008b). The Register includes sites, districts, buildings as well as structures and objects.

Since 1979 a fifty-year rolling rule has been used, opposed to the thirty-year rolling rule by English Heritage, as a cut-off date for selection of sites together with special guidelines, Criteria Consideration G, for evaluating and nominating properties that achieved significance within the past fifty years (Sherfy and Luce, 1998). To qualify as achieving significance in past fifty years the property must be of exceptional importance (Shull, 1998). English Heritage established their thirty-year rule and the ten-year rule for exceptional situations in 1987. The Criteria Consideration G is a very
important step towards overcoming the problems relating to age, and ‘...to avoid judgments based on current or recent popular trends...’ (Sherfy and Luce, 1998).

By 1994 the National Register already included 2,035 properties, out of the 64,000 listings at that time, that had been listed as under Criteria G (Shull and Savage, 1995). Of these 2,035 properties 464 reflected aspect of history since 1950, and seventy-seven properties aspect of history since 1974. One third of the sites were listed for their exceptional importance in community history (Shull and Savage, 1995). By 2003 the Register had increased to 76,000 entries including 2,332 sites listed under Criterion G (Recent Past Preservation Network, 2008a). In 2008 the number of sites on the Register was 88,887 (National Register of Historic Places Reference Team, 2008) and including about 2500 sites that had been listed under Criterion G (Abernathy, 2008). It must be noted that in the database once a site has received a Criterion G this status never goes away. That means that the numbers include everything listed since 1980 under Criterion G and built after 1930 (Abernathy, 2008).

Of interest is that the National Park Service (2008a) has also other programmes to survey landscapes, such as the Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS). It however does not function as an inventory but rather as a programme to document significant landscapes.

6.5 DOCOMOMO Registers

DOCOMOMO highlighted in the Eindhoven Statement from 1990 that one of its main goals should be to ‘...identify and promote the recording of the works of the modern movement, including a register...’ (DOCOMOMO International, 1990). In 1992 DOCOMOMO International established the International Specialist Committee on Registers (ISC/R) with an aim to engage working parties in fostering documentation and in preparing a register that included iconic examples of modern architecture. Three levels of registers were agreed (DOCOMOMO International, 2008b):

1. The local level: the National and/or Regional Register
2. The international level: the International Selection (IS)
3. The global level: World Heritage List (WHL)
A key aim of DOCOMOMO is to document significant examples of the modern movement and to share knowledge worldwide by creating these registers. DOCOMOMO also sees the Register as an ‘…educational tool for the public, to promote the significance of threatened modern buildings and sites, and to foster the identification, local designation, and ultimate conservation of modern movement resources….’ (DOCOMOMO United States, 2007b).

6.5.1 DOCOMOMO National and Regional Registers

National and regional working parties have contributed to the compilation of DOCOMOMO registers since 1992 (De Jonge et al., 2002). Until 1996 much registration work concentrated primarily on pre-1945 buildings, as did the work by DOCOMOMO United Kingdom (Powers, 1996), but later work expanded to include post-1945 buildings and sites (Dunnett, 2002). In the United Kingdom there are three working parties that each compile their National Registers (DOCOMOMO International 2008f). These three are the United Kingdom, Scotland and Ireland. All three chapters also make contributions to the DOCOMOMO International Selection (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers, 2000).

The DOCOMOMO United Kingdom Register had by 2008 443 sites on its post war list. The list is by architect, project and date, but does not have a separate category for landscape. The list is also not yet available digitally (Boyle, 2008). This made it difficult to assess the number of landscapes on the site, but again it is felt that most sites are buildings. DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group completed by March 1994 register fiches for thirty-three sites for the DOCOMOMO Register (DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group, 1994). Later in 1994 another seventeen site fiches where completed (Whitham, 2008). The focus for each fiche was on buildings. Seven of these fiches together with three new fiches were put forward in 1996 for inclusion on the DOCOMOMO International Selection register (DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group, 1996). Seven more fiches were put forward between 2003 and 2007 for the DOCOMOMO International Selection (Whitham, 2008). All of these sites comprised again of buildings.
6.5.2 DOCOMOMO International Selection

For the third DOCOMOMO International Conference in Barcelona in 1994 fifteen working parties had submitted 500 fiches for the International Selection. In 2000 a new format of fiche, the New International Selection, was agreed with an aim to extend existing records and to accommodate a wider range of subjects, including modern urbanism from the post-1945 period (DOCOMOMO International, 2008b). In 2003 about sixty working parties were again asked to submit another five fiches in their New International Selection format (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers, 2000). The DOCOMOMO International selection is kept in the archive collection of the Netherlands Architectural Institute in Rotterdam, the Netherlands (DOCOMOMO International, 2008b). In 2008 it included about 800 buildings and sites from more than thirty-five countries (DOCOMOMO United States, 2007b).

Panayotis Tournikiotis launched in 2002 a thematic approach and every national working party has been asked since 2003 to submit five on a specific theme (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers, 2008):

- 2003: Sports, Body and Modern Architecture
- 2005: The Modern House
- 2006: Other Modernisms
- 2007: Education
- 2008: The Machine and Modern Architecture

To optimise the accessibility of its information and inventories, and to reach new audiences through the use of digital means, the DOCOMOMO International Specialist’s Committee on Registers also announced in February 2003 that an online database was being developed in collaboration with the International Union of Architects (Casciato and d’Orgeix, 2003). The International Union of Architects (2008b) has an existing online database and participation would make DOCOMOMO documentation available to a wider audience. This is done through their Twentieth Century Architectural Heritage Repository Project (International Union of Architects, 2008a). In 2008 about 475 thematic fiches where online available (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers, 2008).
6.5.3 DOCOMOMO and the UNESCO World Heritage List

At a third level of inventory work DOCOMOMO aims to contribute to the selection of sites for inclusion on the UNESCO World Heritage List. In the mid-1990s ICOMOS was working in cooperation with DOCOMOMO (DOCOMOMO International, 2007b) and the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers (2000) to prepare a list for selection purposes of Modern Movement heritage onto the World Heritage List (Sharp, 2000). National working parties were asked to submit by April 1996 up to twenty sites to the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers (1996). In November 1997 the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers (1997) submitted its list of hundred buildings and sites to the ICOMOS as part of the advisory report on the Modern Movement and the World Heritage List. This report and a book with selections from the DOCOMOMO registers (Cooke and Sharp, 2000) are of significant use for the nomination and submissions for UNESCO’s World Heritage List (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers, 1998).

6.5.4 DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group Urban Register pilot project

Acknowledging that the DOCOMOMO Registers mainly listed individual buildings, and struggled to include building groups, the idea of a more specific Urban Register was explored by the International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscapes (ISC/U&L) (Haenraets, 2003) through its Scottish members (DOCOMOMO International, 2007a). This resulted in trial work being undertaken on a DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group Urban Pilot Register (Glendinning, 2004a). This pilot project was initiated by Miles Glendinning and Diane Watters, both former Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments Scotland employees. Both are also members of DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group and of the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscapes. The aim of the Urban Register is to explore more efficient ways to include urban areas, as well as their landscaping components, within the scope of inventorisation. Another ambitious aim of the pilot project was that within the Scottish context it could possibly lead to funding from Historic Scotland for an inventory of modern landscapes in Scotland (DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group, 2003).

The DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group Urban Register fiches used the typology of the Building Classification of the DOCOMOMO International Selection (DOCOMOMO...
International Specialist Committee on Registers, 2000). The initial trial of the Urban Register aimed to prepare fifty fiches, but by 2003 only ten fiches had been completed (Haenraets, 2003). It succeeded in including urban groups and schemes of buildings, but still struggled to incorporate the landscaping elements in the trial fiches (Glendinning, 2004b).

In 2006 a new Arts and Humanities Research Council (2008) funded PhD research project by Jessica Taylor (2006) at the Edinburgh College of Art (originally Strathclyde University, pre-2007) was started to explore further possibilities for the Urban Register, in this case through a New Town Inventarisation Project that would focus on preparing pilot fiches for Cumbernauld New Town, Scotland (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscape, 2007). The New Town Inventarisation Project has also attempted to fill a major gap in the project, namely the difficulty in incorporating landscapes and their components into the project. By August 2008 eighty-eight pilot fiches had been completed of the targeted 140 fiches (Taylor, 2008). None of the fiches are specifically for landscapes but are based on buildings, either clusters of houses, a school or a church. Of significance is that where the landscape is of particular interest for a particular site, this has been described in the fiche (Taylor, 2008).

6.5.5 DOCOMOMO at Risk Lists

DOCOMOMO working parties get frequently involved in case work and their fiches include details on the site’s condition and may mention threats. The DOCOMOMO working parties do not prepare special lists of sites at risk and an active monitoring of all registered sites does not occur. DOCOMOMO does though make contributions to the ICOMOS Heritage at Risk Report (ICOMOS, 2008b) and the World Monuments Fund’s bi-annual list of hundred most endangered sites, as was the case for the listing of St. Peter’s College, Cardross, Scotland in 2008 (World Monuments Fund, 2008a). No special initiatives are undertaken to include designed landscapes of the recent past on at risk lists. Potentially DOCOMOMO could use their inventory documentation and network more proactively to keep at risk lists. If so, the International Specialist Committees on Registers and on Urbanism and Landscapes would be well placed to take a lead in such initiatives.
6.6 The UNESCO World Heritage List

In 1978 the UNESCO World Heritage Convention became operational with the inscription of the first twelve properties on the UNESCO World Heritage List (Lucas, 1992). The key aim of an inscription of a site on the World Heritage List is that it can be a catalyst to raising awareness for heritage preservation, and increases public awareness of the site and of its values. This potentially brings increasing and sustainable tourism which can result in funding and benefits for the local economy, and development of skills and sound management (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2007). The World Heritage List puts an emphasis on significance and not age of a site. Bumbaru highlighted this by saying ‘…the list does not have a special category for recent or old. Outstanding universal value remains the reference. The List is a reflection of how heritage is evolving in terms of perception….’ (Bumbaru et al., 2000).

Since 1992 the World Heritage Centre (2008g) is responsible for coordinating matters relating to World Heritage (UNESCO, 2008d). In evaluating the nominated sites for inclusion on the World Heritage List the Centre and Committee are assisted by three advisory bodies (UNESCO, 2008e). The World Conservation Union (IUCN) (2008) prepares recommendations for the evaluation of natural properties, while ICOMOS
(2008e) evaluates cultural properties. The International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM, 2008c) assists in restoration projects and training in the field of cultural properties (UNESCO, 2008a).

6.6.1 The preparation of lists of sites for selection purposes for the World Heritage List

In the early 1990s the World Heritage Committee did recognise that certain categories of heritage were poorly represented and in 1994 the Committee adopted a Global Strategy to enhance its global representation and diversity of heritage and for a more credible, balanced and representative World Heritage List (UNESCO, 1994). As a result a more pro-active approach is taken to include less-represented categories of heritage on the List, including Modern Heritage. Bumbaru described the effort by saying that it ‘...includes a greater recognition of the heritage of the Twentieth Century, for instance, from design or historical perspective, as well as a greater emphasis on cultural landscapes...’ (Bumbaru et al., 2000).

To achieve a better representation of heritage from the recent past ICOMOS started to cooperate in the mid-1990s with DOCOMOMO International (2007b) and their International Specialist Committee on Registers (2000). The aim of this cooperation was to prepare a list for selection purposes of Modern Movement heritage onto the World Heritage List (Sharp, 2000). DOCOMOMO national working parties were asked to submit by April 1996 up to twenty sites to the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers (1996). In November 1997 the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers (1997) submitted its list of hundred buildings and sites to ICOMOS as part of the advisory report on the Modern Movement and the World Heritage List. The work done by DOCOMOMO national working parties towards this report also resulted in some articles in the DOCOMOMO journal (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers, 1998), and a book with selections from the DOCOMOMO registers (Cooke and Sharp, 2000).

Nevertheless dilemmas remained relating recent past heritage and how to assess its values, as Bumbaru pointed out:

‘...listing recent sites as World Heritage raises ethical and technical issues, many of which are similar to those raised at national level. Can we have
sufficient critical distance to judge the outstanding universal values of a product of our generation? What about the values that are not based on art or history, like technical developments…how do we recognize projects of which original concepts may be of outstanding value but which are physically decaying?…’ (Bumbaru et al., 2000).

While much work by ICOMOS had concentrated from 1995 to 1999 on potential entries for the UNESCO World Heritage List, a change in approach occurred in the late 1990s. Since 1999 ICOMOS has been compiling the ICOMOS World Report on Monuments and Sites in Danger, in short referred to as the Heritage at Risk Report (ICOMOS, 2008b). The ICOMOS Heritage at Risk Report for 2000 made mention of the concerns of many National Committees over Twentieth Century heritage (ICOMOS, 2000).

This motivated ICOMOS to organise in 2001 another special working session on the subject, this time in Montreal, Quebec. The outcome of this meeting was that Bumbaru (2001) distilled the conclusions of the meeting into the Montreal Action Plan on Twentieth Century Heritage. A most important conclusion in the Montreal Action Plan was that ‘…the issue of Twentieth Century heritage and its precursors cannot be reduced to the appreciation of a few great monuments of Modern Architecture, even if such recognition is not always there….’ (Bumbaru, 2001). Based on this it called for an understanding of the full diversity of Twentieth Century heritage, all of the issues related to its recognition and conservation, and a promotion of this heritage (Bumbaru, 2001).

To fulfill the aims in regard of promotion ICOMOS dedicated its International Day on Monuments and Sites in 2002 on conserving Twentieth Century heritage (Fig. 29) (ICOMOS, 2002), and to take the idea of a wider understanding of the diversity of Twentieth Century heritage forward, a series of thematic initiatives were developed over the next years. This was a positive development which potentially also could have resulted in a stronger emphasis on designed landscapes. However, most of the initiatives by ICOMOS and cooperating organisations such as DOCOMOMO continued to look mainly into heritage buildings of the Twentieth Century.
Fig. 29: ICOMOS’s International Day on Monuments and Sites 2002 on conserving Twentieth Century heritage (ICOMOS, 2002).

Fig. 30: UNESCO World Heritage Centre action towards the identification and documentation of Modern heritage (Van Oers and Haraguchi, 2003).
A first initiative that was launched by ICOMOS was a survey of illustrative cases to be completed by April 2002 (Bumbaru, 2001). ICOMOS also explored specific themes at a number of events such as on urban heritage at the 2001 Helsinki symposium on ‘Dangerous liaisons: Preserving post-war modernism in city centers’ (ICOMOS, 2001). ICOMOS National Committees, such as ICOMOS Australia in 2001, also started to pay stronger attention to Twentieth Century heritage (Jones, 2002).

### 6.6.2 UNESCO formalises its actions

ICOMOS continued to liaise with UNESCO’s World Heritage Centre to take the inclusion of Twentieth Century properties on the World Heritage List further forward. It did though take until 2001 for the UNESCO World Heritage Centre to start together with ICOMOS and DOCOMOMO International (2008e) a programme of identification of built heritage sites from the modern era to be considered for inclusion on the List (Bandarin, 2003). In 2001 the UNESCO World Heritage Centre also formalised agreements with DOCOMOMO and the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH) (2008) to strengthen initiatives.

Two expert meetings were organised by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in 2001 to assist in defining the objectives of a programme on Modern Heritage. Proceedings from these meetings (Van Oers and Haraguchi, 2003) (Fig. 30), included papers on the subject of landscapes. Trieb (2003) set the context of open spaces and landscapes, while Birnbaum (2003b) elaborated on the theme of recent developments in the preservation and interpretation of modern landscape architecture in the United States. Birnbaum pointed out that while in 2001 the interest in, and awareness of modern landscape architecture and its preservation appeared to have increased dramatically since 1995, there remained much work to do (Birnbaum, 2003b). Landscape architectural contributions of some of the most renowned architects continued to vanish without any debate or proper protection. Jokilehto spoke at these meetings about continuity and change in recent heritage and pointed out how important it is that we must learn to identify and appreciate these sites, because ‘…efforts may not always have been successful, but there are certainly many masterpieces in our time, as there have been in the past….’ (Jokilehto, 2003).
An expert session on the identification and preservation of modern urban heritage was also held in Paris in 2002 (UNESCO World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, 2002) and more activities were organised by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre with a focus on cultural landscape (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2003), often accompanied with publications (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2003). The result of all these activities was that by May 2003 twelve properties (Table 6.4) on the World Heritage List represented Modern Heritage (UNESCO, 2003). Of these sites only the Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas, Venezuela and the city of Brasilia, Brazil, are post-1945 sites that include significant designed landscapes elements.

### Table 6.4: Modern heritage properties (Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries) on the UNESCO World Heritage List as at July 2002 (UNESCO, 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Parque Guell, Palacio Guell and Casa Mila in Barcelona</td>
<td>1984 (extended in 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Brasilia</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Palaces and Parks of Potsdam and Berlin</td>
<td>1990, 1992, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Skogskyrkogården</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Bauhaus and its Sites in Weimar and Dessau</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Palau de la Música Catalana and Hospital de Sant Pau in Barcelona</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Hospicio Cabañas, Guadalajara</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Museumsinsel (Museum Island), Berlin</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Rietveld Schröderhuis (Rietveld Schröder House),</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Major Town Houses of the Architect Victor Horta (Brussels)</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Tugendhat Villa in Brno</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts continued to build on this and from 2002 to 2005 ICOMOS cooperated with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (2006b) and DOCOMOMO on a series of five regional meetings on Modern Heritage. Their purpose was to inform the identification, conservation and potential nomination of modern heritage properties and sites for the
World Heritage List. The meeting for Latin America took place in 2002 in Monterrey, Mexico. The one for Asia and the Pacific was held in Chandigarh, India in 2003. The third for Sub-Saharan Africa in Asmara, Eritrea and the one for North America in Miami Beach and Coral Gables (USA) in 2004. The last one was for the Mediterranean Basin at the Bibliotheca Alexandrina in Egypt, in March 2005 (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2006b).

In 2006 a conference took place in Moscow (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2006a) and of interest for urban landscapes was the international conference in 2007 which brought the issues of four different modern cities together, including the organising host city Le Havre, France. The other three cities were Brasilia, Chandigarh and Tel Aviv, which all three are inscribed on the World Heritage List (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2008c). A poster contest on the theme ‘Recognition, Valorization and Protection of the Architectural and Urban Heritage of the Twentieth Century’ was held in conjunction with the conference (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2008c).

The result of these efforts is that by 2008 eight sites from the post-1945 period have been added to the World Heritage List. The list now includes 878 places forming part of the cultural and natural heritage, which the World Heritage Committee considers as having outstanding universal value. These include 679 cultural, 174 natural and 25 mixed properties in 141 State Parties (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2008a). As can be seen from Table 6.5 the city of Brasilia appears to have been the first post-1945 site to have been listed. Table 6.5 also illustrates how the efforts by ICOMOS, UNESCO World Heritage Centre and DOCOMOMO from 2002 onwards resulted in several more sites having been listed. The White City of Tel Aviv started before 1945 (Epstein-Pliouchtch and Fuchs, 2008), but the main development phase continued up to 1950. The cut off date of 1945 is also an artificial date when we speak about the recent past and especially Modern Movement heritage. Many more Modern Movement sites from the pre-1945 period stand on the UNESCO World Heritage List. UNESCO now also uses Tentative List (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2008a) from which sites are being put forward each year for inclusion on the World Heritage List. The Tentative list included in October 2008 in total 1468 sites, put forward by 163 of the 185 state parties. The Tentative List includes several post-1945 sites such as the Urban and Architectural Work of Le Corbusier in Chandigarh, India and the Casa
Curutchet, Argentina, also designed by Le Corbusier (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2008a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Sydney Opera House</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Brasilia</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Le Havre, the City Rebuilt by Auguste Perret</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Berlin Modernism Housing Estates</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>White City of Tel-Aviv - the Modern Movement</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Luis Barragán House and Studio</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Central University City Campus of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)</td>
<td>Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The World Heritage List includes many designed landscapes from various historic periods pre-1945, such as Studley Royal and Fountains Abbey, Yorkshire, the Skogskyrkogarden Cemetery or Woodland Cemetery by Gunner Asplund in Stockholm, Sweden or Versailles in France (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2008a). None of the post-1945 sites are pure designed landscapes, but all of them, apart from the Sydney Opera House, do have designed landscaping elements, in particular Brasilia’s urban plan and landscaping stands out (Fig. 31), and the university campuses. Regarding the Tentative List, this certainly is also the case for Chandigarh (Gordon and Killian, 1992).

Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and that deteriorated too badly or are under threat can be included on the UNESCO List of World Heritage Sites in Danger with the aim to encourage corrective measures (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2008f). At present there are 30 sites on the list, none being sites of the recent past.
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The work done towards the inclusion of heritage from the recent past on the World Heritage List contributes generally to raising awareness about the significance of heritage of the recent past. It must however be concluded that even though the General Recommendations on the Protection of Twentieth Century Heritage by ICOMOS (1995) have existed since 1995, by 2008 only very few sites from the post-1945 period have been included on the World Heritage List; Even though the recommendations specifically highlight the need for systematic documentation in all its dimensions.

Fig. 31: Brasilia, Brazil, one of the post-1945 sites on UNESCO's World Heritage List (Author’s photograph).

However, these issues are slowly starting to be taken more serious which is illustrated by the fact that UNESCO officially confirmed its ‘Operational Relation’ with DOCOMOMO International (UNESCO, 2008b). If DOCOMOMO and ICOMOS now start to use this status to put more emphasis on landscapes then progress will speed up in the future.
A positive development in the United Kingdom was also that in 2007 ICOMOS welcomed the news that as a result of the Heritage Protection Review White Paper the Government announced that World Heritage sites would be given statutory protection in the planning system (ICOMOS UK, 2007). This as a measure to improve development control. ICOMOS United Kingdom is of the opinion that World Heritage Sites should receive the highest level of national protection and therefore welcomed this announcement as a step forward, but still awaited how the Government would turn this decision into satisfactory and sufficient measures (ICOMOS UK, 2007).

6.7 The ICOMOS Heritage at Risk Reports

The work by ICOMOS was highlighted before, in particular in relation to the UNESCO World Heritage List. As was mentioned before, another important effort by ICOMOS has been since 1999 the preparation of their World Report on Monuments and Sites in Danger, or the Heritage at Risk reports (ICOMOS, 2008b). The report for 2000 mentioned specific concerns of many national ICOMOS committees over Twentieth Century heritage (ICOMOS, 2000). In the 2002-2003 report ICOMOS paid special attention to Twentieth Century heritage under threat. It did so within an international context with a report by Macdonald (2003) and several national reports. The report for the United Kingdom (Denyer and Cresswell, 2003) highlighted key buildings, garden cities and suburbs, new towns, cinemas, and some religious buildings. Landscapes were not separately highlighted.

The ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage (2008a) was also established together with a series of new initiatives. In April 2006 ICOMOS cooperated with UNESCO to organise a conference that looked within a Russian context at heritage at risk in relation to Twentieth Century heritage on the World Heritage List (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2006a). An outcome was the creation of the Moscow Declaration on the preservation of the Twentieth Century Cultural Heritage (ICOMOS Russia, 2006), which promotes the conservation of Twentieth Century Russian architecture. The 2006 Heritage at Risk Report (Fig. 32) also concentrated on the Soviet Heritage and European Modernism (Haspel et al., 2006).
Another conference took place in Berlin in September 2007 and looked once more at ‘World Heritage Sites of the Twentieth Century: Gaps and Risks from a European Point of View’ (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage, 2007a). The Berlin conference included several sessions that looked at housing estates and one specific session on heritage parks and urban green spaces. The conference once again explored the dissatisfying situation that less than three percent of the about 800 World Heritage sites are Twentieth Century heritage (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage, 2007a). In June 2007 the Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage participated also in a Chicago conference on ‘Identification, Advocacy, and Protection of Post-World War II Heritage’ (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage, 2007b) to explore similar themes.

Fig. 32: The 2006 Heritage at Risk Report also concentrated on the Soviet Heritage and European Modernism (Haspel et al., 2006).

In 2007 ICOMOS organised their International Day for Monuments and Sites around the theme ‘Cultural Landscapes and Monuments of Nature’ (ICOMOS, 2007). The day was also used by the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes and the International Federation of Landscape Architects to announce that they proposed a universal inventory card system that could assist in building up inventories for a diversity of typologies and categories of gardens in any regions or
communities (Zhangheri, 2007). It is hoped that this card system can be promoted to incorporate recent landscape heritage sites. To date it appears though that no ICOMOS initiatives have been undertaken to focus on the presence of designed landscapes from the recent past on inventories.

6.8 Parks and Gardens UK Database

An initiative at national level that must be looked at within this context is the ongoing project to develop the United Kingdom Database of Historic Parks and Gardens (UKPG) (2003). The original database was launched in 1994 at the University of York, in the Landscape Office of the former Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies. The aim was to create a United Kingdom wide database of historic parks, gardens and landscapes in England and Wales and Scotland. The initial database resulted in about 3,500 site records and 1,500 person records (Sturgeon, 2008). After the initial years of work resulting in a database of about 3,000 entries, the initiative stagnated for a number of years.

In 2005 the database received funding of about £1 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund for a project to make it the comprehensive parks and gardens record in the United Kingdom (Parks and Gardens UK, 2008c). The project is jointly managed by the Association of Gardens Trusts and the University of York. The Parks and Gardens Data Services Ltd is now set up as a not-for-profit company and database project. The involvement of the Association of Gardens Trusts (2008) is of particular importance as they can count on a volunteer base through the County Garden Trusts (Association of Gardens Trusts, 2003c). In 2003 the Association of Gardens Trusts (2003d) already organised regional research and recording study days to start training their volunteers to assist with database work. The significance of input by volunteers was also expressed by Kristina Campbell who worked with Historic Scotland on the preparation of their Inventory. She said that in Scotland the work on the Inventory advances slow because of the limited available staff involved in compiling the Inventory and because of the lack of County Gardens Trusts in Scotland (Personal communication, August 29, 2003).

The Parks and Gardens UK Database’s initial ambition was to have around 7,000 records and 500 more records by March 2009, to be available online and to provide
educational resources, virtual tours of gardens and themed articles (Parks and Gardens UK, 2008d). The database was officially re-launched in 2008 as Parks and Gardens UK (2008a) and by early October 2008 held 4,738 records with an expected 1,000 detailed records. The database has a useful advanced search tool which allows a search by periods. A search of the post war period which is defined as from 1945 to 2000 results in a list of 115 records. An additional search under early Twenty-First Century brings up another eight records. This total of 123 sites is about 2.6% of all 4,738 records (Parks and Gardens UK, 2008b). It must be noted that the search tool might omit in the searches under these date ranges a number of older sites that could also have features or elements that were added in the post war period.

6.9 World Monuments Fund: Lists of endangered sites

The World Monuments Fund (2007) publishes bi-annually their international list of hundred most endangered sites and now also encourages individuals and organisations to put heritage from the recent past that is at risk forward for the list. In 2006 the World Monuments Fund (2006) did set up the Modernism at Risk Initiative accompanied by web pages listing Modernist buildings and features at risk (World Monuments Fund, 2008b). In 2008 the bi-annual list included the Joan Miró Foundation in Barcelona, designed by renowned Spanish architect Josep Lluís Sert in 1975, as the youngest building on the list (Fig. 33 and Fig. 34). One post war building from the United Kingdom features on the 2008 list. This is St. Peter’s College, Cardross, Scotland, from the 1960s and designed by Gillespie, Kidd, and Coia (Fig. 28) (World Monuments Fund, 2008a). While it is included for its buildings the site also has landscaping elements.

The fact that the World Monuments Fund has started to raise attention to sites from the recent past is an indication that this is increasingly being recognised as significant heritage, but also that important issues exist concerning the conservation of such sites. However, the landscapes from the recent past are still being overlooked by the World Monuments Fund.
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Fig. 33: The Joan Miró Foundation in Barcelona on the World Monuments Fund’s annual list of hundred endangered sites in 2008 (World Monuments Fund, 2008a).

Fig. 34: Joan Miró Foundation in Barcelona, designed by Josep Lluís Sert in 1975 (Author’s photograph).
6.10 Lists of endangered sites of the recent past

While the study is looking at the issues from the United Kingdom perspective, the work by the Cultural Landscape Foundation in the United States is worthwhile to look at within this context because it is by a not-for-profit organisation and has a landscape specific focus. The Cultural Landscape Foundation (2007) prepares Landslide as an interactive, online resource to enable awareness-building about endangered American landscapes and features lists of endangered, saved and lost sites, based on nominations from the wider public (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2004). Landslide works with special themes such as Designed Landscapes (2002), Working Landscapes (2004), Spotlight on the Garden (2006), Heroes of Horticulture (2007), and Marvels of Modernism (2008) (Fig. 35 and Fig 36). Landslide highlights sites from different periods but regularly includes iconic post war sites, with the 2008 theme on Marvels of Modernism being fully dedicated to recent past sites.

A similar initiative for landscapes cannot be found in the United Kingdom. The closest that comes to this initiative appears to be the online ‘Risky Buildings’ list by the Twentieth Century Society (2008i). It features buildings but some including interesting landscaping elements such as the enclosed garden space at Drapers Gardens (Twentieth Century Society, 2008h), or the landscaping at the Commonwealth Institute (Twentieth Century Society, 2008g). The Twentieth Century Society’s (2008b) online ‘Building of the Month’ list is another example of records of buildings that need recognition. It includes sites from the United Kingdom and abroad. As most activities by the Twentieth Century Society, the list includes mainly buildings. An exception for the United Kingdom is Harlow Water Garden which featured in 2002 when the dismantling was proposed (Fig. 3) (Twentieth Century Society, 2003).
Fig. 35: Marvels of Modernism as the 2008 theme on Landslide web pages of the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2007).

Fig. 36: Naumkeag, Massachusetts, United States, a marvel of Modernism, designed by Fletcher Steele (Author’s photograph).
This initiative can again be compared to work undertaken by the Recent Past Preservation Network (2008b) in the United States who compile an online ‘Endangered!’ list to campaign for better protection of buildings at risk. They also prepare online a list of lost sites under the theme ‘Here today, gone tomorrow’ (Recent Past Preservation Network, 2003e) and give sample nominations of recent past buildings for the National Register of Historic Places on their websites as an encouragement to the wider public to assist in preparing nominations (Recent Past Preservation Network, 2004). The work done by the Recent Past Preservation Network developed from the Mission 66 initiative by Madrid French (2005). To illustrate what impact such work can have it is of use to look at the case of Richard Neutra’s Cyclorama Building at Gettysburg and the work by the Recent Past Preservation Network and Mission66 (2008) and the RE-Cyclorama campaign to save the building. Even though the Cyclorama is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a building of exceptional importance the National Park Service wishes to demolish it (Madrid French, 2004). As a result of the threat of demolition and the commotion created by the Recent Past Preservation Network, the Cyclorama was in 2006 included by the World Monuments Fund (2006) on their list of hundred most endangered places. The campaign sparked other initiatives such as the Neutra Institute for Survival Through Design (2008) which even makes use of new mediums such as MySpace (Neutra Institute, 2008).

The Modern Committees or ModComs in the United States are other initiatives within this context that need mentioning. In a number of cities Modern Committees were established by restoration societies, some as early as 1984, as was the Los Angeles Conservancy’s (2008a) Modern Committee. They are volunteer groups and focus on Twentieth Century architecture and related fields and organise tours, lectures, educational material, exhibitions, research and workshops. Most important is that they also prepare nominations for landmark status. They also call on their volunteers to raise conservation concerns of sites (Los Angeles Conservancy, 2008b). The Landslide initiative in the United States uses similar approaches, but in the United Kingdom such a platform with a specific focus on landscapes of the recent past does not exist. The County Garden Trusts (Association of Gardens Trusts, 2008c) in the United Kingdom do play a role in the Parks and Gardens UK Database (2008a), but as mentioned before, this database has no special campaigns on landscapes from the recent past. Examples from the United States and buildings should though inspire
similar landscape initiatives in the United Kingdom. Especially organisations such as the Recent Past Preservation Network or the Twentieth Century Society could also put much more emphasis on landscapes.

6.11 Key findings

The Heritage Protection Review in England and Wales highlighted the necessity of changes to the current system of inventories. (Department of Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh Assembly Government, 2007). Key organisations such as ICOMOS United Kingdom indicated that they welcome changes to the system, but remain hesitant to embrace the suggestions as the ideal way forward and wait to see whether the proposals are satisfactory (ICOMOS UK, 2007). While the Heritage Protection Review looked at the wider context this research studied the subject from the perspective of designed landscapes of the recent past, resulting in a number of different findings.

Small number of designed landscapes from the recent past on landscape inventories

From the overviews of landscape inventories, such as Historic Scotland’s Inventory, English Heritage’s Register and the Parks and Gardens UK Database it can be concluded that the number of designed landscapes from the recent past on these inventories is small. The thirty-year rolling rule of English Heritage’s Register will contribute to this, and also the interpretation of how age contributes to making a site significant or historic. Given the high number of designed landscapes that have been created since the Second World War these inventories feature far too few sites from the recent past.

General inventories include few designed landscapes

Designated landscape inventories will obviously include all landscapes. There are however also inventories that in theory should encompass buildings and sites, such as those prepared by DOCOMOMO, the Twentieth Century Society and the Recent Past Preservation Network. From the overviews of sites on the registers and lists it is clear that landscapes only feature occasionally in them and mainly include buildings. The case of DOCOMOMO made this particular clear. DOCOMOMO calls itself the international working party for the documentation and conservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the modern movement (DOCOMOMO International, 2008c).
The main shortcoming of the DOCOMOMO registers remains however the presence of sites and neighbourhoods, and specially designed landscapes. DOCOMOMO is very successful regarding promoting the value of buildings, in particular its registers are an impressive record of significant buildings from the modern movement. The fact that their International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscapes is still developing a pilot project for an Urban Register indicates a recognition that there are shortcomings in relation to landscapes.

From this it could be argued that DOCOMOMO does not achieve one of its core aims of the Eindhoven Statement being to ‘…bring the significance of the modern movement to the attention of the public, the authorities, the professions and the educational community concerned with the built environment….’ (DOCOMOMO International, 1990), and this because only part of the modern movement heritage is brought properly to the attention of the public.

**Landscape specialists need to be more involved**

The reason for few landscape sites on inventories and lists of recent past organisations, such as DOCOMOMO, relates to the fact that these organisations put a strong emphasis on buildings. The result is that few landscapes specialist get involved in such organisations. With few landscape specialists involved or taking an interest in these organisations, landscapes will not gain more attention in the organisations objectives. To overcome this, organisations should pro-actively set up more landscape-focused activities, and landscape architects should become more engaged in these initiatives.

**Registers need to be made more known amongst landscape specialists**

While organisations such as DOCOMOMO and ICOMOS are internationally recognised, this remains mainly to a group of specialists. These organisations should aim to get their work more widely known amongst other disciplines, such as landscape specialists.

**Poor accessibility of inventories**

The Heritage Protection Review highlighted issues of accessibility of inventories, records and lists. If the documents where archived digitally, data could be easier accessed. The Heritage Protection Review concluded that the new Register must be
accessible ‘...by anyone with an interest in the historic environment, whether local
authorities, heritage organisations, developers, local and national and amenity
societies, professional and amateur archaeologists, historians and students....’
(Department for Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh Assembly Government, 2007)
and The Heritage Gateway will be in the future the new internet portal through which
the Register can be accessed (Department for Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh

Similar progress could be noted at Historic Scotland (2007b) who already publish the
Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes online, and at DOCOMOMO who now
also make thematic fiches of the International Selection available online (DOCOMOMO
International Specialist’s Committee on Registers, 2008). While a massive amount of
work has been done by DOCOMOMO national working groups, their DOCOMOMO
National Registers databases are often incomplete with clear overviews of all fiches
lacking and fiches mostly only available as hard copies from national working groups
(Whitham, 2008). This is mostly a direct result from the fact that much work on
inventories is done on a voluntary basis. In the case of the DOCOMOMO National
Registers consulting the fiches mostly means you have to travel to the local working
group’s archive and to search the records.

**Restricted thematic search options of inventories**

Accessibility, together with the way of filing records, and the structure of the records
contribute to the difficulty to analyse inventories. Compiling an overview of which
landscapes of the recent past feature on these registers is, for example, a complicated
task. Digital databases can resolve this in the future if proper search options are put in
place.

**Thematic restrictions of inventories**

Some inventories cover only a specific period or stylistic movement. For example, in
the case of DOCOMOMO this is on buildings and sites from the Modern Movement.
While such registers make most significant contributions, it also means that many
significant sites from other periods or movements get excluded from these lists.
Absence of pro-active initiatives in the United Kingdom to nominate sites for governmental listing

The Recent Past Preservation Network was mentioned for working pro-actively towards nominations of recent past buildings for the National Register of Historic Places. The lists and registers of DOCOMOMO or the Cultural Landscape Foundation play similar roles in bringing sites to the attention of governments for official listing, or when they wish to raise threats or conservation concerns to governments. With no organisations in the United Kingdom taking a specific interest in compiling inventories with designed landscapes of the recent past, there is no pro-active work occurring to put recent landscape sites forward for listing.

Organisations that compile general landscape inventories, such as the Gardens and Parks UK Database could potentially make further contributions by preparing pro-active initiatives with lists of sites from the recent past that they wish to nominate for official listing. Similar to the actions by the Recent Past Preservation Network. Valuable contributions could also be made by compiling list of sites at risk, whether they are sites on the registers or not. Similarly records could be kept relating to alterations or damage to sites, or demolition. Manpower shortages and the reliance on volunteers to prepare many of the registers means however that much of such work cannot occur.

With limited work by organisations in the United Kingdom to prepare lists with landscape sites from the recent past that are of significance, government authorities also have restricted documentation available as a reference point for their registration work.

Absence of initiatives by specialist groups

Existing specialist committees with a scope that relates to designed landscapes of the recent past are also too inactive. The DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscape is one of the only specialist initiatives on the subject, but is very inactive, mainly due to the fact of its volunteer status and the global spread of its members.

Need for better statutory protection and control for sites on inventories

Since the General Development Order (GDO) from 1995, local planning authorities must consult English Heritage for grade I or II* registered sites, and the Garden History
Society for all registered sites (English Heritage, 2007b) for applications for development that may affect a registered garden or designed landscape. The same applies for the setting of listed buildings (Banks and Longstaff-Gowan, 1995). In Scotland, Historic Scotland has no statutory advisory role for sites on the Inventory affected by planning proposals (Historic Scotland, 2008f). The inclusion of a site on UNESCO’s World Heritage List at present also brings no additional statutory control in the United Kingdom, nor does inclusion on inventories of other non-governmental organisations.

The Heritage Protection Review for England, Northern Ireland and Wales aims to address the discrepancies in statutory protection and control between listed buildings, scheduled monuments and registered garden and parks by creating ‘...a unified legislative framework for heritage protection that removes current distinctions to deliver a system that works for the whole historic environment....’ (Department for Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh Assembly Government, 2007). The proposed new legislative framework will have a single system for national designation and consents and new policy guidance will be prepared to underpin the new approach. The proposals for the Heritage Protection Review do not apply to Scotland meaning no similar protection is yet planned there.

The Heritage Protection Review clarified that UNESCO will remain responsible for World Heritage Site designation, but it also concluded that while it was believed that World Heritage Sites in the United Kingdom were adequately protected, that changes were envisioned to strengthen protection (Department for Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh Assembly Government, 2007).

The proposals have an impact on designation of sites of national significance and the Heritage Protection Review may give more teeth to inventories, but it remains to be seen how successful this review will be. Local designation remains another concern and the Heritage Protection Review proposes to publish new criteria for good practice of local designation (Department for Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh Assembly Government, 2007). This may stimulate the development of local registers which is a responsibility of Local Planning Authorities in the United Kingdom. Whether this approach will prove successful again is to be seen.
The importance of non-listed sites

Existing inventories are important instruments in the conservation and protection of historic sites but it may not be forgotten that they only include a selection of sites, and that many more sites of significance do not feature on these inventories. For example sites that are not yet old enough to be included, are not recognised or little known, fall under different themes, or do not qualify under the given prescriptions. The risk with inventories is that they may only include a type of hit parade of sites. Roger Emmerson refers to the obsession with lists as if ‘…one stands on the abyss of history gone mad: history as a hit parade, history as an anecdote….’ (Emmerson, 2002).

Sites that do not feature on inventories may however be of greater significance for people’s day-to-day lives than the nationally significance used in the mentioned inventories (Lambert, 2000). The local significance is different from the national significance, but is not therefore less important. This is little recognised in a system that puts the emphasis in conservation on elitist heritage rather than common heritage. Current approaches focus only on part of our heritage, while the whole is of significance, and there is still a need for ‘…a much more finely tuned characterisation of the whole historic resource…’ (Lambert, 2000). Mike Jackson for example argued that while over forty per cent of Americans live in suburbs which are largely post-1945 environments, there still are very few inventories of such areas (Jackson, 1991).

The national and international inventories with our most important sites may create a centralist perspective that even increases the threat to these other sites. Developers and even the government now appear to avoid assaults on the listed or registered sites, but instead will turn their attention to non-registered sites, including gardens, parks, buildings, and sites of local nature conservation value (Lambert, 2000). Lambert calls this ‘…a dangerous moment in the history of conservation, made all the more dangerous by the risk of complacency given what is now the comparative strength of our preservationist legislation for sites and monuments…’ (Lambert, 2000).

The fact that so few designed landscapes of the recent past feature on national inventories, and the threat at local level, make significant designed landscapes of the recent past very vulnerable. Lambert concluded that ‘…the cause of conservation is today at a turning point…’ (Lambert, 2000). To counter this threat and to create a more sustainable approach Lambert proposes that definitions are extended beyond the ‘best’
sites, to include the value of local perception, and to recognise the values of the non-
experts or general public (Lambert, 2000).

**Unified inventories and allowing the listing of groups of features**

While potentially more and more offshoots of inventories may be created, such as the
DOCOMOMO Urban Register, lists on Modern Movement Heritage, Parks and Gardens Databases, and so on, some believe that less offshoots of lists is better. Dominic Cole's view in 2003 was that ‘...the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens is a good system, it can be added to and the County Gardens Trusts are well placed to help with new information. The limitations, if any, are the desire to set up endless offshoots and databases, which can be boring, and distract from the main groups....’ (Personal communication, December 10, 2003). The Heritage Protection Review (Department of Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh Assembly Government, 2007) came in 2007 to similar conclusions and proposed one main new register. This does appear as a constructive way forward, but local registers by local planning authorities and registers by other non-governmental organisations will continue to exist and have their roles to play. The Scottish Government appears to continue with the existing system of separate inventories.

At the ICOMOS United Kingdom conference on Cultural Landscape Management in 2008 attendees voiced the opinion that the Heritage Protection Review and the unified register and legislative protection does not go far enough and that a much more drastic overhaul is required. The conference report sums this up by stating: ‘...legislation in England still essentially Victorian, we need to educate the government in the concept of cultural landscapes; to take a more sophisticated approach…’ (ICOMOS UK, 2008). The current heritage protection systems still reflect the needs of the post Second World War period. No proper protection existed and the response was to establish ways to safeguard individual features, mainly buildings. Funding systems were also put in place to support such protection and the post war rebuilding efforts. Our present systems remain based on these early decisions and many believe that a much more serious overhaul is required of the funding, protection and assessment of our cultural landscape in the United Kingdom.

For example, it is hoped that the new inventory will also allow sufficient flexibility to include the listing of groups of features, or conservation districts. Many schemes from the recent past are of significance because of its group value. National groups such as
the Recent Past Preservation Network and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States have suggested that local conservation districts might limit demolitions or drastic alterations. For example, a group of Cleveland architects, led by Ted Sande, began cataloguing downtown highrises in 2007 to consider a historic highrise district (Palmer, 2007).

6.12 Conclusions

A key conclusion from this study of inventories is that much work is being done by several governmental and non-governmental organisations. Approaches differ though and work on landscapes is still lagging behind in comparison with buildings. The number of designed landscapes of the recent past that can be found on inventories is in general still almost irrelevant, taking into account the number of sites which exist. Basically much work still has to start. Overviews of work done by different organisations is also lacking and there needs to be more of integrated thinking.

It can be concluded that the actions towards documenting and registering sites, as requested in the recommendations studied in Chapter Two and illustrated in Table 2.1 in Appendix 1, are still not achieving the desired results. It is unacceptable that so few sites are included on inventories, which demands a review of approaches. Governmental and non-governmental organisations must make more effort to implement the recommendations and not just pay lip-service to them. For example special working groups can be established to address the backlog in listing work of designed landscapes of the recent past. The protection of significant designed landscapes deserves as much attention as buildings. For example why should tax payers’ money just be spent on buildings work to the exclusion of landscapes. The efforts and money put towards building conservation by agencies such as Historic Scotland and English Heritage is disproportionate to the work done on the subject of historic landscape conservation. Similarly some of the key non-governmental organisations that focus on the heritage of the recent past, such as DOCOMOMO, the Twentieth Century Society or the Recent Past Preservation Network, should all review their activities to include designed landscapes more in their activities, including their work on inventories and lists.
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CHAPTER SEVEN

7 ANALYSIS OF ROLES AND INITIATIVES BY KEY STAKEHOLDERS

7.1 Introduction

In the literature review of Chapter Two the existing initiatives, actions and research were examined and the conclusion was that there was a need in the research to further validate these initial findings. To assist with this a clear overview of key stakeholders in the process of the conservation and protection of landscapes of the recent past (Table 3.3) was developed in Chapter Three, and in Chapter Five the issues in relation to the continuing destruction and disfigurement of significant sites were explored further to validate the findings of the initial literature review. In Chapter Six a similar exercise concentrated on providing more clarity in relation to existing registers and inventories.

With this insight available we will in this chapter take a closer look at the role and work of key stakeholders at an international and national level. The emphasis of the study is on activities in the United Kingdom but lessons can be learned from the international context. However, given the large number of organisations that exist within an international and national context clearly not all activities of all organisations can be analysed, but key initiatives that were observed with relevance to the United Kingdom context are included where possible. The result is that the analysis provides an overview of progress achieved by key stakeholders and remaining gaps in practice and knowledge, and validates the findings of the initial literature review. To allow a structured overview, the analysis is summarised under two headings:

1. Initiatives of stakeholders acting at an international level, but relevant to the issues in the United Kingdom; and

2. Initiatives by stakeholders acting at a national level, mainly within the context of the United Kingdom but useful examples from abroad have also been included.
7.2 Key Initiatives by stakeholders acting at an international level

This section looks at the roles and activities of stakeholders acting at an international level and which are relevant to the issues and context of the United Kingdom. In order to identify the key organisations that are needed to play a role in the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past a number of online directories of organisations were used as a starting point. An overview of the main resources that were accessed will be given. After this an overview is given of key initiatives undertaken by the stakeholder organisations to assist in validating the findings of the initial literature review. Table 2.1 in Appendix 1 also illustrates a chronological overview of key initiatives by stakeholder organisations acting at an international level.

7.2.1 An overview of key stakeholders acting at international level

To identify the main organisations and governmental bodies that have a significant role to play at an international level (Table 7.1) in the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past several online directories are a good source. The directories of the European Heritage Network (2008a), the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM, 2008a) and Europa Nostra (2009) were all most valuable for the research. ICOMOS (2008e) has several useful resources, including its online web page with links to key organisations (ICOMOS, 2008d), the databases of International Scientific Committees (ICOMOS, 2008f), and the resources of the International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS-IFLA, 2008). Based in North America are the Landscape Architecture Online directory by the University of California Berkeley (2008) and the Landscape Architecture Virtual Library by the Centre for Landscape Research at the University of Toronto (2008) which both proved useful.

From the analysis of these resources it became clear which the key organisations are at governmental and non-governmental level. Under international governmental authorities or international authorities with governmental membership the initiatives by the European Union (2008) and the United Nations (2008) are of particular relevance to heritage management and landscape conservation. The European Union is clearly
important within the context of the United Kingdom and significantly the European Union has prepared several recommendations that are most relevant to the research subject, including the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000). Under the initiatives of the United Nations the work of UNESCO (2008c) and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (2008b) are also of high relevance within the research subject. Europa Nostra (2008) must also be mentioned as it is the pan-European Federation for Cultural Heritage and as such a representative of over 220 Non-Governmental heritage organisations. It is Europa Nostra’s aim to bring heritage in the public mainstream and to promote the highest possible standards of conservation.

Under non-governmental initiatives the assessment showed that in particular membership organisations and organisations with educational purposes play an important role within an international context. Within membership organisations some accept members from the wider public while professional membership organisations in general accept only specialists within the discipline. A most relevant organisation with an open membership is DOCOMOMO International (2007b). ICOMOS (2008a) on the other hand restricts its membership to professionals and as such acts as a network of experts including architects, historians, archaeologists, art historians, geographers, anthropologists, engineers and town planners. Both organisations are internationally active and have national working parties (DOCOMOMO International, 2008a), international specialist committees (ICOMOS, 2008f) and national Committees (ICOMOS, 2008h). Amongst non-governmental membership organisations also the work of the International National Trusts Organisation (INTO) (2009), which brings together trusts from around the world, is of interest. The World Monuments Fund (2006) was already mentioned under inventories and may also not be omitted. It is a private organisation and is active in over 90 countries. Of interest also is in an Asian context the Modern Asian Architecture Network (MAAN) (2008). Preparations for the establishment of the Modern Asian Architecture Network took place at a meeting in Guangzhou in July 2000 (Modern Asian Architecture Network, 2004). The official founding conference took place in Macau in 2001 and received the active support and attendance from ICOMOS and UNESCO (Modern Asian Architecture Network, 2005).

Within the context of landscape architecture and garden heritage the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA) (2008) and its European regional representative, the European Foundation of Landscape Architecture (EFLA) (2008)
function as professional membership organisations. A network that is again open to anyone with an interest in landscape architecture is the European Landscape Architecture Network (ELAN) (2008). The European Garden Heritage Network (2004) is also an international organisation with a mission to inform and raise awareness. The Historic Gardens Foundation (2008a) is based in London, but operates as a charitable organisation with an international scope, was founded in 1995 to link enthusiasts of historic gardens around the world and campaign for the protection and appreciation of sites.

| Table 7.1: Overview of key stakeholder organisations acting at an international level. |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Governmental authorities or authorities with governmental membership | Professional Membership Organisations | Member organisations | Educational Organisations | Others |
| Council of Europe | ICOMOS | DOCOMOMO | ELCAS | World Monuments Fund |
| United Nations | IFLA | ELAN | ELASA |
| UNESCO | EFLA | INTO | Le:Notre |
| Europa Nostra | MAAN | Historic Gardens Foundation | |
| | | European Gardens Heritage Network | |

Educational initiatives at an international level that have to be noted include the European Council of Landscape Architecture Schools (ECLAS) (2008), the European Landscape Architecture Student Association (ELASA) (2008), and LE:NOTRE (2008), a thematic network project for landscape architecture education. To assess the initiatives that educational institutes have undertaken on the subject of the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past, online directories of these initiatives were good resources.

The activities of these organisations were studied in depth. Internet directories and resources were analysed, publications were assessed, memberships were taken up, activities and events attended, and several working groups or committees were attended where possible.
7.2.2 Initial initiatives by international organisations and authorities

From the literature review in Chapter Two and the study of inventories in Chapter Six it became clear that at an international level four organisations have played a most significant role in taking the conservation of heritage of the recent past forward. These organisations are ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO, the Council of Europe and UNESCO. From the analysis in Chapter Two and Six it became clear that by the mid-1980s the calls for recognition of recent architectural heritage were starting to get heard (Luxen, 1995) and the first notable initiative on the subject of recent past heritage by any of these organisations was the ICOMOS seminar on Twentieth Century heritage that took place in 1985 in Paris (Luxen, 1995). It was in the wake of this seminar that several initiatives started to develop, including the founding of DOCOMOMO in 1988 and the 1990 Eindhoven Statement (DOCOMOMO International, 1990), which sets out DOCOMOMO’s aims. The Council of Europe also took on board the importance of heritage of the recent past around the same time and held its first colloquy on Twentieth Century architectural heritage in Vienna in 1989 (Council of Europe, 1994). In his opening speech José Maria Ballaster of the Council of Europe remarked that it was high time that we started to recognise the contribution made by Twentieth Century movements. He said so in 1989 sensing how we were on ‘…the eve of a new phase in European heritage policies...’ (Ballaster, 1994). It was the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe, known as the Grenada Convention (Council of Europe, 1985) that in his opinion enabled an inclusion of new categories in an extension of the concept of heritage, referred to as ‘new heritages’ (Ballaster, 1994). The initiatives around this date focused still on Twentieth Century architecture and not landscapes, and addressed questions relating raising awareness (Rothery, 1994) and inventories of sites (Henket, 1994)

Chapter Two and Table 2.1 in Appendix 1 described how this emphasis on ‘new heritages’ resulted in 1991 in the Council of Europe’s ‘Recommendation on the Protection of the Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage’ (Council of Europe, 1991). The Recommendation and the Eindhoven Statement (DOCOMOMO International, 1990) were two key milestones. The Recommendation made the case for the treatment of Twentieth Century architecture as an integral part of historical heritage. Most importantly the Recommendation highlights that due to this heritage being recent, abundant in examples and diverse in character, it’s significance is less well recognized by authorities and the wider public. To avoid this resulting in irreparable losses which
would deprive future generations of part of our culture, the Council therefore recommended that governments of member states would develop ‘...strategies for the identification, study, protection, conservation, restoration and public awareness of twentieth-century architecture...’ (Council of Europe, 1991). Even though the recommendation was written from the perspective of architectural heritage, the recommendations also spoke up for landscape architectural heritage.

In the wake of the creation of these recommendations several initiatives on recent past heritage by these international bodies occurred. The Council of Europe for example explored further documenting methods (Council of Europe, 1992), including at a colloquy in Nantes (Council of Europe, 1993), and published specific recommendations on documenting (Council of Europe, 1995b). ICOMOS dedicated some publications to the subject such as on conservation work of the Bauhaus in Dessau (Bumbaru, 2001) and as mentioned in Chapter Six, DOCOMOMO started an impressive initiative to compile through national working parties a register of significant sites with a focus on Modern buildings and sites (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers, 2000).

While DOCOMOMO, ICOMOS and the Council of Europe had already launched several initiatives and DOCOMOMO and the Council of Europe had even published recommendations, UNESCO had only by 1994 started to focused action on the subject of the recent past. In Chapter Two it was mentioned how UNESCO had instructed ICOMOS to prepare a report on the subject (Luxen 1995) and how this after the ICOMOS Helsinki seminar culminated in the publication by ICOMOS of their ‘General recommendations on the protection of Twentieth Century heritage’ (ICOMOS, 1995). The recommendations reiterated the value of systematic documentation but more importantly, they also highlighted the issues relating to new technologies and to proper education and training (ICOMOS, 1995). The call for more research into the materials and technologies used in the recent past echoed the aims of the DOCOMOMO Eindhoven Statement (DOCOMOMO International, 1990).

In the mid-1990s the implementation of these recommendations gained momentum amongst these international organisations, with DOCOMOMO in particular developing valuable work. Through the work of the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committees a number of preservation technology dossiers and journals were prepared.
The DOCOMOMO publications on technological issues appear however to only address, to date, main building materials such as metal (DOCOMOMO International, 1994), concrete (DOCOMOMO International, 1997a; DOCOMOMO International, 1998), curtain walls (DOCOMOMO International, 1997b), windows (DOCOMOMO International, 1999), or wood (DOCOMOMO International, 2000c). No similar initiatives could be found that studied the conservation issues of hard and soft landscaping materials of landscape architecture of the recent past.

ICOMOS followed its Helsinki seminar up with another seminar on the subject in Mexico City (ICOMOS, 1996). As a result of these seminars Twentieth Century heritage now features firmly on the UNESCO agenda. Because UNESCO had been the instigator of the seminars, the main focus of the seminars was potential World Heritage sites and the context of the World Heritage Convention (Bumbaru, 2001). Therefore these initiatives contributed little towards the protection of Twentieth Century heritage of local significance. Landscapes of the recent past were also not covered.

The analysis of the work by these organisations did bring to light that until the mid-1990s no significant initiatives were undertaken with a special emphasis on landscapes of the recent past. ICOMOS and the Council of Europe were from the mid 1990s onwards until after 2000 still much occupied with the preparation of general principles for improving the conservation of cultural landscapes. The Council of Europe published in 1995 its recommendation on the integrated conservation of cultural landscape areas as part of landscape policies (Council of Europe, 1995a) with the most significant step forward being the approval in 2000 of the European Landscape Convention in Florence (Council of Europe, 2000). The main specific charter by ICOMOS on landscapes remained the Florence Charter of 1981, jointly prepared with the International Federation of Landscape Architects (ICOMOS-IFLA, 1981). Many specialists argued however that the Florence Charter was outdated and the ICOMOS Burra Charter (ICOMOS Australia, 1999) was already used by many specialists to overcome shortcomings of the Florence Charter. In the United Kingdom the ICOMOS National Committee (ICOMOS UK, 2000) and their ICOMOS United Kingdom Cultural Landscapes and Historic Garden Committee (Walshe, 2006) also saw the need for a stronger emphasis on the subject of landscapes and brought in May 2000 specialists together at the Oxford University Conference on Cultural Landscapes. Papers were
These initiatives show an increased focus on cultural landscapes but very little action has occurred on the subject of landscapes of the recent past over these years by these organisations. The ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes, a joint committee of ICOMOS and the International Federation of Landscape Architects (ICOMOS-IFLA, 2008), appeared well placed to stimulate initiatives on the protection of landscapes of the recent past, but apparently did not focus on the subject. ICOMOS actions on Twentieth Century heritage continued to be dominated by buildings subjects. In DOCOMOMO action on landscapes also remained modest, but at least progress could be noted. At the DOCOMOMO International conference in Barcelona in 1994 (DOCOMOMO Spain, 1995) discussions led to the setting up of a DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Gardens and Landscapes (Panzini, 1996). The committee explored the possibility of bringing experts together and initiating a campaign to put gardens and landscapes more in the spotlight within DOCOMOMO. This led to a session on landscapes at the international conference in Bratislava in 1996 (Bubičková, 1997). A year later DOCOMOMO dedicated an issue of its journal on Urbanism, Gardens and Landscape (De Jonge and Doolaar, 1997) which included an article on modern park design by Lodewijk Baljon (1997), on three French modern gardens (Belier et al., 1997), and the sculpture garden spaces at the Fondation Maeght (Birksted, 1997).

The Specialist Committee on Gardens and Landscapes operated for a couple years as a sub-committee to the Specialist Committee on Urbanism (De Jonge and Doolaar, 1997), but became the joined Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscapes (De Jonge et al., 2002). Even though these were first signs of increasing attention on the theme of landscapes of the recent past by DOCOMOMO, the initiatives remained low key and sparse up to 2000.

7.2.3 Initiatives by international organisations and authorities since 2000

While, by 2000 several landscape conventions and recommendations were in place and with specialist committees on landscapes at ICOMOS and DOCOMOMO, the conclusion from the analysis is that landscapes of the recent past still only receive
limited attention in these organisations especially when compared with the developments on the conservation of buildings of the recent past. The progress with landscapes of the recent past on the inventories and listings of ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO and UNESCO which was analysed in Chapter Six also showed disappointing progress with only a small number of included sites being landscape sites.

A trend able to be observed after 2000, is that more thematic studies were undertaken to look into various aspects of the recent past architecture. DOCOMOMO continued to set examples. For example, a number of its journals looked at different types of modernism, such as Modern Houses (DOCOMOMO International, 2000a), the Modern City (DOCOMOMO International, 2000b), and even ‘Other Modernisms’ (Casciata et al., 2007). Another series of DOCOMOMO journals looked at certain countries or regions, such as the Middle East (Casciata et al., 2006), the Caribbean (Casciata et al., 2005), or post-1945 Modernism in the United States (Casciata et al., 2004). In the meantime DOCOMOMO national working parties explored themes, such as at an International seminar in Greece on ‘The Body, Sport and Modern Architecture’ (Tournikiotis, 2003). In contrast, since 2000 the DOCOMOMO journals only included sporadically a landscape themed article (Meurs and Doctor, 2003). The idea of thematic publications is nevertheless in line with the approach requested by the ICOMOS Montreal Action Plan, which called for an understanding of the full diversity of Twentieth Century heritage and the issues relating to its conservation (Bumbaru, 2001).

Amongst the few initiatives on landscapes that could be noted were some occasional papers or poster displays at conferences. For example, at the international DOCOMOMO conference in Turkey a poster display presented by Haenraets (2006), which is included in the appendices. The DOCOMOMO conference in New York included only one paper on the subject, but it highlighted many of the key problems that relate to trying to save a designed landscape from the recent past from development threats. In this paper Ann Komara used the example of Lawrence Halprin’s Skyline Park in Denver (Komara, 2004) which now has been demolished (Komara, 2006). The Tenth International DOCOMOMO Conference in 2008 addressed the theme ‘The Challenge of Change’ (DOCOMOMO The Netherlands, 2007) and included two sessions on reconstructing cities and landscapes. The sessions grouped
a number of landscape papers, including the subject of this research (Haenraets and Ebohon, 2008). This paper is also included in the appendices. The same conference session included a paper by Parmeet Singh Bhatt (2008), who explored some of the problems and threats to the modern urban landscape of Chandigarh, India. The city of Chandigarh’s urban masterplan was designed by Le Corbusier after the Second World War, and its open spaces are now under threat because its intended population of 500,000 has increased by another 500,000. The joint session with the author resulted in the establishment of an initiative to bring together the theoretical findings of this thesis with the practical challenges of Chandigarh. It was agreed that this initiative would be explored as a project under the auspices of the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscape (2007), of which the author of this research is a member, and which Bhatt has also joined (Glendinning, 2008). The DOCOMOMO International Committee on Urbanism and Landscape only meets about once a year and has only taken a few small scale initiatives forward, such as the DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group’s Urban Register pilot (Glendinning, 2004a). The underlying reason for the limited activities and slow progress by the Committee is the fact that all initiatives rely on the voluntary input of its members and that members are located in different continents.

At ICOMOS progress could be noted with the founding in 2005 of their International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage (ICOMOS, 2008b). An assessment of this committee’s initiatives and members makes it clear that the Committee, at present, mainly consist of architects and historians and retains a focus on buildings (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage, 2007b). The Committee’s scope at present includes the whole Twentieth Century, but it acknowledges that this may in the future be redefined to concentrate on the recent past (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage, 2008b). The Committee builds on the earlier work done by ICOMOS and strives for more concentrated action, and sees its role as addressing the lack of recognition, technology, materials and design issues, and enabling partnerships. It is recognised that it is ‘…apparent that the legacy of the early Twentieth Century is increasingly understood and well managed…’ (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage, 2008b) and that the period of the second half of the century requires more attention. From the perspective of this research an additional recommendation is that the Committee establishes close links with the ICOMOS Committee on Cultural
Landscapes (ICOMOS-IFLA, 2008), and allows landscape specialists to become involved in the Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage. With the right membership and objectives ICOMOS can press through these two committees for the necessary initiatives for designed landscapes of the recent past.

Other organisations, which act at an international level, only a few initiatives were observed that relate to landscapes of the recent past. This indicates that there is still not sufficient awareness amongst most organisations. The lists of most endangered sites by the World Monuments Fund (2008a) featured a few buildings from the recent past but no landscapes yet. The Historic Gardens Foundation (2008b) occasionally mentioned in their journal landscapes of the recent past at risk. Examples are the Water Gardens at Harlow New Town, designed by Sir Frederic Gibberd (Groves, 2003) and the threat to the Commonwealth Institute and the landscaping, designed by Sylvia Crowe (Mawrey, 2008). Europa Nostra organised at their 2007 annual congress (Europa Nostra, 2007) an ‘Add Modernism!’ forum, where a declaration was presented to stimulate the addition of modernist cultural heritage to local, national and European conservation agendas (Europa Nostra, 2007). It appears, however, that Europa Nostra has not organised dedicated initiatives on the conservation of landscapes of the recent past. Other internationally active organisations also appear to still not have taken specific actions on the subject of designed landscapes of the recent past and their conservation forward. A key conclusion is therefore that while many initiatives have been undertaken, too few still occurred that covered landscape topics.

Table 7.2 in Appendix 4 lists in a chronological order some of the key initiatives by International voluntary organisations and charities.

### 7.3 Key Initiatives by stakeholders acting at a national level

After a study of the initiatives undertaken by organisations that act at an international level the research will look in more detail at the initiatives by stakeholders acting at a national level. As mentioned examples were studied that are relevant to the context of the United Kingdom and further useful examples from abroad have been included. In order to identify the key organisations that are needed to play a role in the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past again, a number of online directories of organisations were used as a starting point. This section will therefore also start with
an overview of the main resources that were accessed. Subsequently an overview is given of stakeholders’ key initiatives to help validate the findings of the initial literature review.

Table 7.3 in Appendix 5 includes a chronological overview of key initiatives by stakeholder organisations acting at a national level.

7.3.1 An overview of key stakeholders acting at national level

The main organisations that play an important role at national level were also identified by using online directories as a resource. The analysis of these resources allowed the creation of an overview of main organisations under the categories of national agencies or government organisations, non-governmental organisations, training and educational institutions, enterprises and publishers, and archives and repositories.

National agencies or government organisations

To study heritage programmes of European national governments and administrations the European Heritage Network (2008b) provides a most useful online portal and directory with entries by European member states and themes that list organisations and people and even holds a database of voluntary initiatives (European Heritage Network, 2008e). Under the United Kingdom and ‘Agents (Organisations and People)’ the site provides information about the national administrations, including the existing institutions, their addresses and the number of personnel working on conservation (European Heritage Network, 2008d). The overviews show that key governmental institutions (European Heritage Network, 2008c) include the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (2008) and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) (2008) in England, and the Department of the Environment in Northern Ireland (2008).

The government’s statutory non-departmental bodies that act as advisors or executive agencies for matters concerning heritage and conservation include English Heritage (2008a), Cadw: Welsh Historic Monuments (2008), Historic Scotland (2008d), the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments Scotland (2008), and Environment and Heritage Service (2008) for Northern Ireland. English Heritage (2008d) and Historic Scotland (2008a) both play a leading role in the safeguarding of
the historic environment, including designed landscapes. They retain inventories (Historic Scotland, 2007b) and registers (English Heritage, 1998b) of significant gardens and designed landscapes, prepare guidance for the wider public and manage a restricted number of significant landscapes. The Inventory in Scotland is now also accessible online (Historic Scotland, 2007b), while the websites of Historic Scotland and English Heritage are also useful portals for further research on the subject. In Northern Ireland and Wales similar initiatives to develop inventories are being taken forward. Given the context of landscapes it is also important to acknowledge the roles of institutes such as Natural England (2008), Scottish Natural Heritage (2008), the Countryside Council for Wales (2008), and the Forestry Commission (2008).

Another agency of interest in England was only established in 1999 and is the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) and their CABE Space (2008) program for working towards better public spaces in towns and cities. CABE strives for ‘an improvement in people’s quality of life through good design’ (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, 2008). With their dedicated urban space program they are a unique agency that should also have an influence on the conservation of spaces from the recent past. Its online links also function as another useful portal for further research.

Governments in the United Kingdom also make use of Advisory Councils to provide independent strategic advice to the Ministers. Within the heritage subject an example of such Non-Departmental Public Body in Scotland (Scottish Executive, 2003) is the Historic Environment Advisory Council for Scotland (2007). The Government however frequently reviews its policies on Public Bodies as part of governmental changes or election outcomes, which means these Public Bodies may unexpectedly cease their activities.

At local government levels there are different types of authorities, such as County Councils, Boroughs, District Councils, and Unitary Councils, each with useful websites. In the United Kingdom there are over 500 Local Authorities which are the owners of many historic parks and gardens, including many that were created in the recent past. The one-stop information gateway for local public services is Info4Local (2008). This portal gives quick access to information from central government departments, agencies and non-departmental public bodies.
In many other countries similar national government structures exist. The study compared the United Kingdom context with examples in the United States. Here the setting up of the National Park Service (2006) is of most interest as it represents one of the most comprehensive governmental structures to support the management of cultural landscapes, which include designed landscapes (Birnbaum et al., 1996). Beyond caring for over 400 national parks, the National Park Service, a division of the United States Department of the Interior, assists in the conservation of important local heritage.

The National Park Service’s online resources are extensive and general information pages such as their home page (National Park Service, 2006) provide good information to the wider public. Several specialised programmes that focus on the aspects of cultural landscapes, designed landscapes and historic landscapes are most excellent portals to a vast amount of resources on the subject. The Olmsted Centre for Landscape Preservation (2008) and the Conservation Study Institute (2008) need mentioning for their cultural landscape programmes. Several other programmes have produced a range of publications that contain relevant information. These include the Historic Landscape Initiative (2008b), which publishes the electronic information series called Cultural Landscapes Currents (Historic Landscape Initiative, 2008a), and Vineyard (Historic Landscape Initiative, 2008d). The Cultural Resource Management Periodical (CRM) (2008), and the National Register Publications (National Park Service, 2008b) are two more resources that will be mentioned again later for their work on the recent past.

The National Park Service also has a large number of survey and recording programmes that result into significant databases with a number of entries that relate to the recent past. These include the Historic Documentation Programs (2008) which include the Historic American Landscapes Surveys (HALS) (2008) and the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) (2008). The official list of cultural resources in the United States that are seen as being worthy of preservation is the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (2008a), which also is administrated by the National Parks Service. The National Centre for Preservation Technology and Training (NCPTT) (2008a) also has important documentation that needed to be studied. As will become clear from the study, important lessons learned can be learned from the United States.
Non-governmental organisations

In the United Kingdom there is a remarkably large number of charities and voluntary organisations active within the heritage and conservation sector. Online directories were again used to assist in gaining an overview of organisations that are involved in landscape conservation. A complication was that even though many organisations are involved in the conservation of historic landscapes in the United Kingdom, there is no overarching organisation or website that gives comprehensive overviews. The absence of such initiative is a problem that has been acknowledged for years and the ‘Feasibility Study for an organisation to assist with the conservation of historic parks and gardens’ by Elisabeth Banks Associates in 1995 (Banks and Longstaff-Gowan, 1995) aimed to explore new routes to address this issue. Only limited progress has been made since 1995 and even in 2008 organisations such as the National Trust (2008b) continue to raise this at appropriate times as an ongoing issue.

This meant that for this research exercise the directories in related fields had to be studied to filter out the landscape initiatives. A useful starting point was again the Historic Environment Information Resources Network and its HEIRNET register (2008). Another good resource is the Archaeology Data Service (2008). This is a consortium of the Council for British Archaeology and several universities as well as maps information systems dealing with the historic environment across the United Kingdom.

Given the economical value of the heritage business online directories with a commercial scope also had to be studied. The Building Conservation Directory web pages have an online version of the Building Conservation Directory (2008a), an annually printed guide to specialist consultants, conservators and suppliers of products and services for the conservation of historic buildings, in the United Kingdom. This directory also includes entries under the heading ‘Organisations; Advisory Bodies and Associations’ (Building Conservation Directory, 2008b), and under ‘Organisations; Landscape Conservation Organisations’ (Building Conservation Directory, 2008c). The Heritage Information (2008) website and the Architectural Heritage Web Pages (2008) are other sites that aim to make it easier for those involved in building or garden conservation to find the right skilled specialists.
A number of heritage organisations also have very useful online directories that were studied. Those include the Heritage Lottery Fund (2008) and the Architectural Heritage Fund (2008). The Heritage Lottery Fund pages include countryside, parks and gardens information under its sources of specialist advice. Similarly the United Kingdom Association for Preservation Trusts (APT) (2008) is a national charity with a remit to encourage and assist over 180 building preservation trusts in expanding their capacity to preserve and re-use the built heritage.

Other useful references to landscape conservation initiatives within the United Kingdom could be found on resources the of the Garden and Landscape Heritage Trust for the Advancement of Education and Training (GARLAND) (2008), the Association of Gardens Trusts (2003b), the National Trust (2008a), and the National Trust for Scotland (2008a), and the Parks and Gardens UK Database (Parks and Gardens Data Services Limited, 2008). The Association of Gardens Trusts currently has one of the most comprehensive lists of links to garden conservation organisations and initiatives in the United Kingdom, including a good portal to County Garden Trusts (Association of Garden Trusts, 2003c). The Association of Garden Trusts represents about thirty-six County Gardens Trusts that are ‘...actively engaged in conserving, researching, documenting and caring for our heritage of parks, gardens and designed landscapes...’ (Association of Gardens Trusts, 2008a). The National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland own and manage a large number of designed landscapes including some of the recent past or with added layers from the recent past. Other portals with information on private gardens include the National Gardens Scheme (2008) and Scotland’s Gardens Scheme (2008).

Special attention was also given to garden history themed websites. The Garden History Society (2008a) provides many resources on garden conservation as does the Garden History Links website by Edwinna Von Baeyer (2003) which is based in Canada. When researching the subject it also became clear that many initiatives exist in the United States that needed to be looked at. The directories of the Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation (2008) and the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2008h) were useful starting points for such an exercise.

Horticulture is another important thematic angle and the web sites of the National Council for the Conservation of Plants and Gardens (NCCPG) (2003), the Institute of
Horticulture (2003), and PlantNetwork (2008) all have information on organisations. The Royal Horticultural Society (2008a) has links sections including to gardens across the United Kingdom. Lastly a number of organisations that focus on conservation of heritage of recent past were studied. The sites of the Twentieth Century Society (2008j), DOOCOMOMO International (2008c) and the Recent Past Preservation Network (2008c) are key examples.

Training and educational institutions

To arrive at an overview of what training institutions exist, and what activities had been undertaken, publications were studied and online information portals were again used. For training overviews on the subject of horticulture in the United Kingdom, the learning web pages of the Royal Horticultural Society (2008b) and the Sector Skills Council for the environmental and land-based sector (Lantra, 2008), are good resources. At present a large number of courses exist in the subject of landscape architecture and the 2008 established website initiative called ‘I want to be a landscape architect’ (Landscape Institute, 2008b) provides an overview of available courses in the United Kingdom, with links to the institutes. Several academic institutions also host excellent directories on landscape architecture, such as the Landscape Information Hub, based at the University of Greenwich (2008).

For directories on the subject of heritage conservation courses there are again a variety of online portals. Good resources can be found for the United Kingdom at the website of Robert Gordon University (2003), Aberdeen, and the Building Conservation Directory (2008b). For the United States the Cornell University (2008), provides links to conservation courses on its Preserve Net as does the National Centre for Preservation Technology and Training (NCPTT) (2008b) of the National Park Service. The International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM, 2008b) also has a training directory and search engine on the subject of landscapes and historical gardens.

With an overview of key institutes available the documentation about existing courses in horticulture, landscape architecture, conservation and related subjects was studied to establish what initiatives educational institutes have undertaken on the subject.
Enterprises and publishers

For documentation on landscape enterprises the publications and online portals of organisations such as the British Association of Landscape Industries (BALI) (2008), Landscape Architecture Resources (2008) and the European Landscape Contractors Association (ECLA) (2008) are valuable. For the garden tourist industry Visit England (2008) and Visit Scotland (2008b) provide online portals, with garden directories such as Discover Scotland’s Gardens (Visit Scotland, 2008a). Sites such as Garden Visit (2008) have online garden and landscape guides to gardens, designers, landscape architecture, garden history, tours and products.

Professional membership organisations within the field of landscaping again are helpful portals with directories for landscape practices and consultants. The Landscape Institute (2008a) is the chartered body in the United Kingdom for landscape architects and professionals, and the Landscape Institute Scotland (2008) is the Scottish branch. The Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) (2008) is the architectural counterpart. The Society of Garden Designers (2008) and the Association of Professional Landscapers (2008) also operate in the United Kingdom. Similar chartered bodies and professional organisations exist in other countries, such as the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) (2008) and the Association of Professional Designers (2008), both active in the United States. Useful resources on skilled specialists were also the Heritage Information (2008) website, the Architectural Heritage Web Pages (2008), and the Building Conservation Directory (2008a). The Directory is an annually published guide with lists of consultants, conservators and suppliers of products and services for the conservation of historic buildings in the United Kingdom.

Archives and repositories

A key reference document to assist with defining main archives and repositories within the context of this research was the publication on ‘Researching a Garden’s History: A guide to Documentary and Published Sources’ by David Lambert, Peter Goodchild and Judith Roberts (1995) which sets out what repositories and documentary information should be considered when undertaking such research. The publication grouped repositories in three different categories: Local, national, and international or in other countries. For the United Kingdom the publication grouped under local repositories for example privately owned archives, archives of publicly owned estates, county or other...
local record offices, library services and museums. Sites and Monuments Records, local authorities and County Garden Trusts also play a role at local level. Academic institutions can also be classified under local level, with many universities having special landscape design archives and libraries. In many cases records of landscape design for private properties have also been kept by the owners.

At national level national reference libraries such as the British library, the National Library of Scotland, the National Monuments Record, and Public Record Offices were pointed out. The Royal Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments falls under this category. Important mapping documentation is also kept at national level at for example the archives of Ordnance Survey and Aerofilms Ltd. Professional membership organisations also were classified under national archives with The Landscape Institute (2008c) and The Royal Institute of British Architects (2008) being most important. Horticultural and garden history organisations also have national specialist libraries or archives, with the Lindley Library of The Royal Horticultural Society in London and The Garden History Society’s collection at the University of York being relevant. Certain museums also retain archival material on designed landscapes, including The Victoria and Albert museum, and the Museum of Garden History.

In other countries similar archives and repositories will exist, often with good collections of information on British designed landscapes. International conservation organisations and institutes also build up significant archival collections and libraries. Important within this context are the documentation centres and libraries of ICOMOS (2008c), the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM, 2008c), the Getty Research Institute (2008) and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (2008d).

Since the 1990s the internet has also become a new source for archival material on designed landscapes, with many institutions making their records accessible online. The significance of the internet as a reference and archival resource will certainly increase in the future. A new trend that can be seen on the internet are online virtual libraries with a number of virtual landscape libraries now launched.
For the purpose of the literature review the research looked at archives and repositories to establish what special initiatives exist with a focus on designed landscapes of the recent past.

### Table 7.4: Overview of key stakeholder organisations acting at a national level.

| Governmental authorities or authorities with governmental membership | Non-Governmental |
|---|---|---|---|
| Professional Membership Organisations | Membership Organisations | Educational Organisations | Others |
| • English Heritage (UK) | • ICOMOS UK (UK) | • LANTRA (UK) | • SAVE Britain (UK) |
| • Historic Scotland (UK) | • Landscape Institute (UK) | • RHS (UK) | • MIT Press (USA) |
| • Cadw (UK) | • Landscape Institute Scotland (UK) | • DOCOMOMO United Kingdom (UK) | |
| • National Park Service (USA) | • ASLA (UK) | • DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group (UK) | |
| | | • Garden History Society (UK) | |
| | | • Twentieth Century Society (UK) | |
| | | • Cultural Landscape Foundation (USA) | |
| | | • Recent Past Preservation Network (USA) | |
| | | • The National Trust (UK) | |
| | | • The National Trust for Scotland (UK) | |
| | | • The National Trust for Historic Preservation (USA) | |
| | | • Modern Committee of the Los Angeles Conservancy (USA) | |
| | | • Wave Hill (USA) | |
| | | • CABE/SPACE (UK) | |
| | | • Royal Horticultural Society (UK) | |
| | | • MIT (USA) | |
| | | | |

#### 7.3.2 Initial initiatives by national organisations and authorities

The analysis of organisations acting at an international level already showed that in the mid-1980s the first initiative on the subject of recent past heritage gained momentum (Luxen, 1995). Similarly, it became clear that also a changed attitude towards heritage of the recent past could be observed in the 1980s amongst organisations that act at a national level.
Of importance is that also at national level a number of new organisations and pressure groups were founded. An early example was the founding of the Los Angeles Conservancy Modern Committee (2000) in 1984, in response to the rapid destruction of a generation of post-war buildings. Within the context of the United Kingdom, the Thirties Society had been inaugurated in 1979, but only when the Society was renamed the Twentieth Century Society in 1992 (Stamp and Powers, 2008) their mission became inclusive of post-war architecture. In response to the creation in 1988 of DOCOMOMO International (1990), a national working party for the United Kingdom was also established in 1990 (Dunnett, 2002) and in 1992 a separate one for Scotland (Glendinning and Whitham, 2002). By 2008 DOCOMOMO counted fifty-two National Working Parties, and over 2000 members (DOCOMOMO International, 2008d).

Members of these organisations were influential in building a momentum for more interest and initiatives towards the conservation of heritage of the recent past. An early example of campaigning by non-governmental organisations in the United States occurred in 1978 by Chester Liebs (1978) who posed the question ‘Remember Our Not-So-Distant Past?’ in the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s magazine. In 1989, at the Council of Europe’s colloquy in Vienna on Twentieth Century architectural heritage and strategies (Council of Europe, 1994) both Hubert Jan Henket (1994), founder of DOCOMOMO International (2008e), and Gavin Stamp (1994), Chairman of the Thirties Society (Twentieth Century Society, 2008e), delivered papers.

The subject matter of initiatives in the 1980s remained strongly focussed on the theory and history of recent past architecture, with few events only looking into landscape architecture, such as in the case of the 1989 ‘Modern Architecture (Re)evaluated’ symposium at the University of California, Berkeley. Papers were published in a book edited by Trieb (1993) and highlighted that the seminar’s impetus was to review accomplishments and limitations of modernism in landscape architecture and to ‘…balance the inside perspective of the designers, and to extend insight...’ (Trieb 1993).

By the early 1990s initiatives were still mainly contributing towards three main objectives: developing a better theoretical understanding of recent past architecture, increasing awareness of recent past heritage, and improving protection and understanding through inventory work. This reflected the objectives of the main
recommendations that existed at that time (Appendix 1), in particular the Recommendation on the Protection of the Twentieth Century Architectural Heritage (Council of Europe, 1991) and the Eindhoven Statement (DOCOMOMO International, 1990). Both documents emphasised understanding and inventory work. The Eindhoven Statement does also encouraged the development of appropriate techniques and methods of conservation, but until the mid-1990s limited process was made in this area.

As discussed in Chapter Six, sites of the recent past started to be considered for inclusion in inventories in the late 1980s as a result of the changes to the listing regulations, with English Heritage having introduced in the United Kingdom in 1987 the thirty-year rolling rule (Page, 1992), and the National Park Service in the United States having adopted in 1979 their special guidelines for evaluating and nominating properties that achieved significance within the past fifty years (Sherfy and Luce, 1998). While progress with inventory work in the early 1990s was explained in Chapter Six, the work done towards raising awareness and enhancing understanding must be further clarified.

What became clear from the research is that there was an increase in publications, exhibitions and thematic studies on the subject of recent past architecture. Non-governmental organisations and government authorities both made significant contributions to this, frequently in partnership. Publishers also started to take more of an interest in the subject, making valuable contributions towards documenting and distributing understanding. DOCOMOMO national groups in the United Kingdom, the Twentieth Century Society and English Heritage played key roles in raising awareness. The DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group was inaugurated at the Visions Revisited conference in Glasgow in 1992 (Glendinning and Whitham, 2002), the first conference to look at post war architecture in Scotland (McDowell, 2004). It was followed in 1993 by a series of ‘Mind Meetings’ organised jointly with the Royal Fine Art Commission for Scotland (Glendinning, 1997). English Heritage together with the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England organised an exhibition in 1994 on The Age of Optimism: Post-war Architecture in England 1945-70 (Fig. 5) (Saint, 1994). In 1996 a series of brochures were published under the title ‘Something Worth Keeping?’ (English Heritage, 2008e) including one on Post War Architecture in England (Fig. 5) (Harwood, 1996). English Heritage’s efforts were clearly influenced by pressure groups
such as the DOCOMOMO working parties (Harwood, 1992) or the Twentieth Century Society (Harwood, 1996), and frequently occurred in partnership with them. Historic Scotland appeared to show little initiative in comparison to English Heritage. A significant event in the recognition of recent past heritage was also the acquisition by the National Trust in 1994 the home of the modern architect Erno Goldfinger, built in 1939, and located at 2 Willow Road in Hampstead, London. While the house does not date from the post war period, it represented a symbolic step forward in the recognition of Twentieth Century buildings (National Trust, 2008d).

In the United States similar activities could be observed with the National Park Service publishing a first themed issue on the recent past in the Cultural Resource Management Journal in 1993 (Shiffer, 1993b). The emphasis here was also on researching what sites exist (Shiffer, 1993a), listing and preparing inventories (Lemon and D’Agostini, 1993), to assist a clearer understanding of the significance of the recent past (Longstreth, 1993).

That there was still a strong emphasis on the theory and history of recent past architecture in the United Kingdom can be observed by reviewing the books published in the early 1990s. A large number of books on buildings of the recent past had been published, while only few publications appeared on landscape architecture of the recent past. One of the earlier examples was the 1985 book that reviewed fifty years of the Landscape Design magazine and that gave an overview of areas of work by landscape architects (Harvey and Rettig, 1985).

Regarding relevant publications, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press was a trendsetter by reprinting the 1939 texts on ‘Landscape Design for Urban Living’, by the iconic designers Gareth Eckbo, Dan Kiley and James Rose (1939) in a publication that critically reviewed modern landscape architecture (Trieb, 1993). The same book also reprinted writings by Christopher Tunnard (1942) on ‘Modern gardens for modern houses’ from 1942. This publication included papers by iconic designers of the recent past and of leading designers of the late Twentieth Century, such as Martha Schwartz (1993). A first ever bibliography of pioneers of landscapes design confirmed in 1993 the growing interest in the United States in landscapes of the recent past (Birnbaum and Crowder, 1993), with a book on ‘Invisible Gardens’ further pushing the subject into the spotlight (Walker and Simo, 1994).
In Europe and the United Kingdom the book on Modernist gardens in France by Dorothée Imbert (1993) followed a similar trend, together with a series of essays and books on iconic landscape architects such as Christopher Tunnard (Neckar, 1993), or Sir Jeffrey Jellicoe (Spens, 1994) and his landscapes (Spens, 1993). The Landscape Institute (1994) also acknowledged the renewed interest in the subject by printing a guide to Twentieth Century British landscape. Publications on landscape architecture remained though rare and by 1995 most initiatives still focused on buildings of the recent past. Similarly initiatives only rarely specifically studied or addressed the issues relating to the practical conservation of this heritage.

Under initiatives by international stakeholders it was already mentioned that towards 1995 the emphasis started to shift slowly towards these conservation issues and the technological questions. This reflects the arrival of several new recommendations, as illustrated in Table 2.1 in Appendix 1, which strongly iterated the need to improve our awareness of new technologies and asked for research programmes on specific problems concerning techniques and materials, and a better knowledge about how to maintain and conserve these assets (ICOMOS, 1995; Kriviskey, 1995; Shiffer, 1995).

As a result several studies into technologies were completed such as the before mentioned technological dossiers by ICOMOS International. Several similar actions also started to take be undertaken at a national level with new research, seminars and studies starting to look into the technological challenges (McAslan, 1995) and the preservation dilemmas of working with new materials (Jester, 1993). In the United Kingdom English Heritage set up case studies (Croft, 1995; Croft, 1996) and some specialist conferences. The first such conference was 'Modern Matters' (English Heritage, 1995) which explored the principles and practices of conserving recent architecture. The conference did not, however, focus on landscape architecture. A second conference was organised in 1998 on 'Preserving post-war heritage', with a focus on the care and conservation of post war listed buildings (English Heritage, 1998a). Publications of the proceedings of these two conferences in book form (Macdonald, 1996a; Macdonald, 2001) made the speakers' papers accessible to a wider audience and assisted further with raising awareness, principally amongst architectural specialists. At the 'Modern Matters' conference several English Heritage specialists illustrated case studies, while a number of practices illustrated recent
conservation projects and highlighted technical issues. At the ‘Preserving post-war heritage’ conference speakers explored the context and the framework for protection, after which subjects relating to structural issues, concrete and cladding were elaborated. Susan Macdonald (1998) explored the conservation methodology for modern buildings, and new dilemmas regarding authenticity (Macdonald, 1996b). This subject, and the question about a need for new conservation guidance for heritage from the recent past, was further explored in other contributions to publications by English Heritage staff (Croft and Harwood, 1999).

In the meantime similar initiatives that focused on buildings related conservation issues also were set up by academic institutions, such as the conference on the conservation of Twentieth Century historic buildings at the University of York in 1996 (Burman et al., 1996), or non-governmental organisations, such as ‘The Modern City Revisited’ in 1999 (Dunnett, 2001), held by DOCOMOMO United Kingdom and the University of East London (1999), with proceedings published as a book (Deckker, 2000b). The main focus was on cities but some attention was given to the landscape aspects (Deckker, 2000a).

When comparing this with activities in the United States we see that around the same time similar initiatives occurred. In 1995 the National Park Service together with the Preservation Education Foundation and the Association for Preservation Technology International organised the first ‘Preserving the Recent Past Conference’ in Chicago (Slaton et al., 1995). The conference again highlighted the lack of understanding and awareness of heritage from the recent past, or as Richard Longstreth (1995) put it; ‘I can’t see it; I don’t understand it; and it doesn’t look old to me’. The involvement of the Technical Preservation Services (2008) of the National Park Service and the Association for Preservation Technology International however confirmed that the emphasis started to shift towards material and technological issues. The Technical Preservation Services must be seen as one of the first institutes that started to look closely at this topic as they had since 1993 invested in a groundbreaking initiative that aimed to develop an online database on recent past materials, their repair and maintenance (Jester, 1993). The online database proved at that time to be still too ambitious and instead findings were published in 1995 in book format, edited by Jester (1995). The book is now referred to as ‘…the first in-depth survey of important construction materials used since 1900…’ (Jester, 1995). A series of papers from the
‘Preserving the Recent Past Conference’ conference were published in a special issue of the Cultural Resource Management Journal (Shiffer and Park, 1995), and the published proceedings also provided a new wealth of information on materials (Slaton et al., 1995). The same conclusion as within the context of international stakeholders can here be reached, namely that these studies all concentrated on materials for buildings and that similar studies on landscaping materials were still absent towards 1995.

In 1995, finally, the first conference took place that aimed to address the gap in landscape related events. This was however in the United States, where the ‘Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture’ conference (Fig. 7) (Birnbaum, 1999b), was held by the National Park Service and their Historic Landscape Initiative (2008c) at Wave Hill (2008), New York. The event brought together preservationists and designers, some of whose works were considered significant works from the recent past (Walker, 1999), to start addressing the conservation issues of recent past landscape architecture. The conference initiated discussions about the values of these ‘invisible gardens’ (Walker and Simo, 1994) and the reasons why these landscapes continue to struggle to be recognised as important works of art (Walker, 1999). The action points that Birnbaum (1999b) put forward at the conference, can be seen as a first attempt to develop specific recommendations for preserving these landscapes. Birnbaum’s main action points were mentioned in Chapter Two and are included in Table 2.1 in Appendix 1. It took a further four years for the proceedings to become available in book form, finally resulting in the first dedicated book on the preservation of designed landscapes of the recent past (Fig. 7) (Birnbaum, 1999b). The Cultural Landscape Foundation (2008d), founded in 1998 by Birnbaum, editor of the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture proceedings, made several papers available online to enable international specialists and the wider public to benefit from these insights.

In the United Kingdom the mid-1990s remained a period where still very few and small initiatives occurred around the theme of landscapes of the recent past. Some new research was completed that contributed to a theoretical understanding of designs from this era, such as the doctoral thesis by Dr Jan Woudstra (1997) on garden theory and design of the modern movement, or the monographs on eminent landscape architecture practitioners of the recent past by the Landscape Design Trust (2008). These included monographs on Geoffrey Jellicoe (Harvey, 1998) and Sylvia Crowe
(Fig. 37) (Collens and Powell, 1999). Of later date are those of Francisco Caldeira Cabral (Andresen, 2001) and Peter Shepheard (Fig. 38) (Downs, 2004).

Fig. 37: The Landscape Design Trust's monograph on Sylvia Crowe (Collens and Powell, 1999).

Fig. 38: The Landscape Design Trust's monograph Peter Shepheard (Downs, 2004).

Studies that started to look more at the conservation questions remained though sporadic and had limited breadth, such as the academic research projects by Duterloo (1995), on the conservation of the modern gardens and houses by William Lescaze of the inter war period, and Chloe Newham (1996), who explored the subject of conserving campus landscapes of the 1960s. At English Heritage the Gardens Register Team started in the late 1990 to liaise with the Post War Listing Steering
Group for buildings on designations of post war gardens and landscapes (Harwood, 1997), but as we will see later, more research on the subject only progressed after 2000.

Some of the most interesting conservation specific work in the United Kingdom was possibly produced by consultancy agencies that were involved in producing advice for landscapes of the recent past, such as the historic landscape surveys by Land Use Consultants for the garden at Sanderson Hotel Courtyard, London (Land Use Consultants, 1998) and the Gibberd Garden in Harlow (Fig. 44) (Cole, 2001). A problem remained, however, that landscape professionals themselves remain often ignorant and unaware of the significance of the recent past and often cause irreversible damage. Birnbaum raised therefore at the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture conference the need to educate owners and public stewards (Birnbaum, 1999a).

Longstreth was worried in 1991 that ‘...if we continue to disregard so much that is all around us, we may waste far more than preserve....’ (Longstreth, 1991) and Birnbaum warned in 1995 again that ‘...if we allow these losses and modifications to continue – unmonitored by the profession and allied communities – we run the risk of erasing a significant chapter of landscape architecture....’ (Birnbaum, 1999a). It is clear that landscape professionals need to become more aware, but in the meantime the issue is not helped by the fact that landscape professionals often struggle to be heard in major projects, which are often dominated by architects, engineers, and even politicians (Haenraets, 2001).

In the United States similar trends occurred in the late 1990s with several books being published by Spacemaker Press on renowned architects of the recent past such as Hideo Sasaki (Simo and Dillon, 1997) and Peter Walker (Levy and Walker, 1997). They also launched books on key landscape sites from this era such as the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial in Washington DC, designed by Lawrence Halprin (Dillon, 2006), or the book by Gary Hildebrand (1999) on the Miller Garden, designed by Dan Kiley. Academic contributions included the work by Harvard University Graduate School of Design (1997) on the work of Dan Kiley, and the University of California (1998) which elaborated the legacy of Thomas Church.

From the above we can conclude that governmental and non-governmental organisations, academic institutions, publishers and consultants were all contributing
towards the end of the 1990s to the conservation of landscapes of the recent past. A key conclusion is that in the United Kingdom initiatives appeared more infrequent than in the United States and especially that in the United Kingdom the focus on specifically the conservation issues were hardly being addressed with organisations still mainly looking into the theory and history of this heritage. Another confirmation of this is that the first dedicated conference that looked back at the history of post war gardens was only in 1998 organised in the United Kingdom, three years after the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture conference in the United States. Most important, the conference still avoided the subject of conserving sites and was named the first Twentieth Century conference on the history of post war gardens and landscapes in the United Kingdom (Moggridge, 1998). While the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture conference in the United States was driven by governmental and non-governmental initiatives (Birnbaum, 1999b), the Twentieth Century conference in the United Kingdom was primordially a non-governmental initiative of the Twentieth Century Society and the Garden History Society (2008c). This highlights again the more passive role taken by the government in the United Kingdom on the subject. Papers were also published by a non-governmental organisation. The Garden History Society did so in 2000 in their Garden History Journal (Woudstra and Ratti, 2000).
### Table 7.5: Chronological overview of founding dates of key specialist committees and pressure groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date founding</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>ICOMOS UK Historic Parks and Garden Committee, which became the ICOMOS UK Cultural landscapes and Historic Garden Committee (Goodchild, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Thirties Society (Stamp and Powers, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Los Angeles Conservancy Modern Committee (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO International (2007b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO United Kingdom (Dunnett, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Renaming of the Thirties Society into the Twentieth Century Society (Stamp and Powers, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group (Glendinning and Whitham, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Gardens Landscapes (De Jonge et al., 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>The Cultural Landscape Foundation (2008d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.2000</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscapes (De Jonge et al., 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>The Recent Past Preservation Network (2008c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century (2008b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.3.3 Initiatives by national organisations and authorities since 2000

In the analysis of Chapter Two, and under the above analysis of international initiatives, it became clear that after 2000 several new events occurred that aimed to
bring the importance of architecture of the recent past and its conservation more to the attention of the wider public. The second Preserving the Recent Past conference in the United States (Slaton and Foulks, 2000a) and the ICOMOS Montreal Action Plan (Bumbaru, 2001) were two key events which outcomes and recommendations (Table 2.1 in Appendix 1) must be seen within this context. Birnbaum was in 2002 again elemental in organising the second Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture conference on ‘Making post-war designs visible’ (Fig. 9) (Birnbaum et al., 2004). The Wave Hill Charter on the Preservation of Modern Landscape Architecture was approved at this conference by the speakers and attendees (Birnbaum et al., 2004) and to date remains the only charter on the subject. With the Wave Hill Charter the attendees urge the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) (2008) to ‘...develop national guidance and ethics regarding the ongoing preservation and management of national significant works of landscape architecture from the recent past...’ (Birnbaum et al., 2004) before it is too late, and to avoid seminal works from this period being destroyed or altered without informed decision making and public discourse.

Particularly in the United States many significant initiatives could be observed around 2000. The Recent Past Preservation Network (2008c) was inaugurated in 2000 in the United States, an initiative by Christine Madrid French, as non-governmental platform to assist in the conservation of places of the recent past and uses the medium of new technologies to campaign and educate. Madrid French had also founded the Mission 66 initiative in 1998, to campaign for the protection of Mission 66 visitor centres in the National Park Service (Madrid French, 2008). It was mentioned before that Birnbaum in 1998 established the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2008h), which remains to date the only not-for-profit foundation in the United States dedicated to raising awareness about the importance and irreplaceable legacy of cultural landscapes.

Within the European context the most important event in 2000 for landscape conservation was the launch of the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000). The Convention asked state parties to sign up to six specific measures, including awareness-raising, training and education, identification and assessment, landscape quality objectives, and implementation. In addition the Convention asks for cooperation between parties, joint policies and public participation in the conservation process (Council of Europe, 2000). Because the European Landscape Convention
specifically asks for state parties to implement the Convention’s measures, it is therefore useful to benchmark the progress made since 2000 by stakeholders that act at a national level against the measures initiated by the Convention.

Table 7.6 illustrates how the thirteen recommended areas of action identified in the Conclusions in Chapter Two and Table 2.1 match up with the measures put forward by the European Landscape Convention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main measures of the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000)</th>
<th>Headings of recommended areas of action (A to M) of Table 2.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identification and assessment | A. Survey, analysis and evaluation of sites  
E. Understanding technological and material challenges  
F. Understanding the wider context of landscape architecture of the recent past  
J. Monitor and record keeping |
| Training and education | L. Training and education |
| Landscape quality objectives | C. Management and maintenance programmes of sites |
| Cooperation and joint policies | G. Use of established methods and principles  
H. Cooperation and partnerships  
I. Development of national strategies |
| Awareness-raising | D. Promotion, raising awareness and communication |
| Protection and legislation | B. Legal Protection and Listing |
| Participation | K. Consultation and participation |
| Implementation | M. Funding |

7.3.3.1 Identification and assessment

The European Landscape Convention and other recommendations ask for progress with the identification of its landscapes and the assessment of their values. The European Landscape Convention specifically states that it also applies to ordinary
everyday landscapes (Council of Europe, 2000) and therefore is relevant to landscapes of the recent past. The analysis in Chapter Two also showed that some existing recommendations highlight the need to improve the understanding of designed landscapes of the recent past.

Further research confirmed that various stakeholder contributions did assist in recent years with strengthening the theoretical understanding of diverse aspects of landscapes of the recent past. Understanding increased in relation to:

- The history of the period
- Iconic sites
- Designers of the period
- Various thematic subjects
- Technologies and materials

The methods to achieve a furthering of our understanding and the types of initiatives varied widely, as did the types of stakeholders involved. In Chapter Six progress with the preparation of inventories, which makes a significant contribution towards understanding, was already analysed. The next overview will therefore look at a number of other examples of initiatives by stakeholders that contributed towards the understanding of landscapes of the recent past.

In the United Kingdom a number of initiatives were observed since 2000 that looked into the general history of the period. The Garden History Society dedicated in 2000 a journal to the theme of ‘Garden history: reviewing the Twentieth Century landscape’ (Woudstra and Ratti, 2000) and launched in 2002 an online collaborative research project to compile a history of post war gardens (Fig. 13), hoping to receive input from the wider public (Garden History Society, 2003b). Around the same time Janet Waymark (2003b), Jane Brown (2000), and Michael Spens (2003) all published books on the subject of iconic gardens from the modernist period. By examining sites throughout the world Brown and Waymark trace landscape design and familiar designers from the Twentieth Century, while Spens explores the issue of landscape and aspects of landscape architecture at the start of the Twenty-First Century through a study of international projects. At the same time similar initiatives could be observed abroad and inspiration for other useful contributions should be looked at to enhance action in the United Kingdom. For example the online timeline of built architecture of
the modern era in Canberra, Australia, by Martin Miles (2008). An accessible timeline of designed landscapes of the recent past would be most helpful but is not yet available for the United Kingdom. Another example that could inspire this can be found in the proceedings of the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture conference (Meyer, 1999).

Good contributions towards widening understanding have also been made through research work on designers and iconic sites. In the United Kingdom examples are the books on the London Gardens by John Brookes (Simms, 2004); Little Sparta, Ian Hamilton Finlay’s own garden in Scotland (Sheeler, 2003); or the housing landscapes of Eric Lyon and Span (Simms, 2006b; Simms, 2003). Of similar interest are publications in the United States such as works on Fletcher Steele (Karson, 2005). Publishers that continued to make valuable contributions towards this subject include Spacemaker Press in the United States and the Landscape Design Trust (2008) in the United Kingdom. The Landscape Design Trust have published additional monographs of eminent landscape architecture designers of the recent past.

Thematic studies also made significant contributions to improving the understanding of these landscapes. In the United Kingdom, English Heritage (2003a) committed under their thematic research projects in 2003 for a first time to a study on the subject of landscapes of the recent past subject, namely on landscapes of post war housing developments (Simms, 2003). The London Gardener, the journal of The London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust (2008), had also published findings on post war housing landscapes (Simms, 2001). The New Town Inventorisation Project at the Edinburgh College of Art and with links to the DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group contributed valuable understanding to the theme (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscape, 2007).

Within the context of thematic research on recent past subjects English Heritage also organised a listing seminar on the subject of the design of campuses and educational institutions (Cherry, [no date]) and set out to identify Cold War period and military sites of significance (English Heritage, 2003c). These studies focused primarily on buildings. An observation is again that similar thematic studies had already been conducted in the United States about five to ten years sooner (Worden and Calvit, 1993; Wharton, 1999; Blick and Sciuto, 1999).
It can be concluded that progress in the United Kingdom remained slow in comparison to developments in the United States, where more of a momentum appears to have occurred, and with a wider variety of themes researched, including campus landscapes, recreation and entertainment sites, and playgrounds. It also appears that a wider group of stakeholders made contributions. In the United States, campus design had already received attention at the conference on Preserving the Recent Past in 1995 (Chambers, 1995) but the theme was explored again in depth at a conference at Wave Hill, New York (National Park Service, 2001), which involved the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2008i) and the National Park Service. Furthermore, towards the end of the 1990s publications started to praise the significance of playground designs by designers such as Paul Friedberg (Dalton, 1999; Bennett, 2004), Richard Dattner (Fig. 39) (Gotkin, 1999), and Isamu Noguchi (Crowder, 1999). In May 2005 the National Park Service went another step further and organised the first major forum on the subject in Chicago (Slaton et al., 2006). The significance of post war elements within recreation landscapes and visitor facilities also gathered recognition in the United States and resulting in exemplary documentation on Mission 66 visitor centres of the National Park Service (Fig. 40) (Allaback, 2000) and their landscaping (Carr, 2007). In the United Kingdom much of the post war visitor centres heritage is at a high pace being lost with no comprehensive studies in place. For example the National Trust for Scotland’s building and landscaping programmes of the 1960s under the philosophies of ‘History on the Spot’ and the ‘chain-link’ system for road travellers (Wemyss, 1962) demands for further research. A study undertaken by Haenraets (2008) during the scope of this research on the development of the Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Site made a start on this and might ignite other initiatives.
Fig. 39: Richard Dattner’s renovated Adventure Playground in Central Park, New York (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 40: Sarah Allaback’s book on Mission 66 visitor centres (Allaback, 2000).
The work achieved by organisations acting at a national level towards increasing our understanding of technologies and materials can also be seen as thematic research. On average, only few initiatives could be noted that focused specifically on developing practical understanding of hard and soft landscaping materials of this period, leaving a gap in the available documentation. As mentioned before, much data has however been developed on the subject of materials and technologies for buildings, and already some of this knowledge can be applied to landscape materials. Examples of specific landscape related studies include a paper on the use of concrete in the London Gardener (Simms, 2006a); and the study in the United States from the Preserve and Play conference, by the Technical Preservation Services of the National Park Service, which resulted in technical documentation about playground features (Slaton et al., 2006).

To assess the progress that was made towards understanding of the history of this period, it is most important to reflect on the role of catalogues of landscape records and their contribution towards enhancing understanding. In the United Kingdom relevant catalogues of landscape records and the actual records are held by several non-governmental organisations. The Garden History Society (2007) retains a catalogue of its library, a bibliography, and a reading list on aspects of the garden history subject. The Royal Horticulture Society (2007) has an online horticultural database with plant information and literature references. Furthermore, the library and archives of the Landscape Institute hold a collection of drawings and papers from some of the greatest landscape architects including Sir Geoffrey Jellicoe, Sir Peter Shepheard and Dame Sylvia Crowe. This specialist collection is recognised as one of Europe's best on landscape architecture and of much interest for Twentieth Century landscape design records (Landscape Institute, 2008c). Nevertheless, there is not yet a dedicated catalogue of landscape records of this period in the United Kingdom.

It appears that in the United States more progress has been made on this subject. The Recent Past Preservation Network retains an online historical bibliography of architecture, landscape architecture, and urbanism in the United States since the Second World War. It is compiled by Longstreth (2007) and gets updated annually. They also retain a ‘Who’s Who of the Recent Past’ resource online (Recent Past Preservation Network, 2005a). Wave Hill in New York maintained from 1987 to 2003 a catalogue of landscape records in the United States. Since October 2003 this
catalogue has been hosted by the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2006b) under the name ‘Pioneers’ (Wave Hill, 2003). It has been exemplary in building up archival documentation on designed landscapes with a strong focus on the recent past. The title ‘Pioneers of American Landscape Architecture’ has for example also been used at conferences as a theme for raising awareness and understanding (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2002). The Pioneers initiative gathers under their Profiles project (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2008f) interviews, videos, images, writings, and articles about practitioners (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2006a). The Pioneers initiative resulted in significant publications including a book on Pioneers of Landscape Design by Birnbaum and Karson (2000), which built on work from 1993 (Birnbaum, 1993; Birnbaum and Crowder, 1993) and holds 160 biographical essays. A second Pioneers book (Birnbaum and Foell, 2009) includes another 150 essays, many on key landscape designers from the recent past such as Lawrence Halprin, Paul Friedberg, Garret Eckbo, Hideo Sasaki, and Dan Kiley (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2008e). The initiative is further promoted online to raise awareness (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2008g) and the Oral History Initiative of the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2008c) continues to gather interview material with designers, stewards, and educators. Catalogues in the United Kingdom appear to miss such strong emphasis on the recent past and overviews of key designers are not yet published as such.

To enable further study of the history of the period it is essential that archives of landscape practitioners are safeguarded. Birnbaum saw two key problems regarding such archives, namely that ‘…finding a home for landscape architect’s archives can be as challenging as convincing practitioners to donate their collections to an institution….’ (Birnbaum, 1999a). Often documents are destroyed, including by practitioners, as a result of the unawareness of their significance. Birnbaum felt that by 1995 the situation had already improved considerably in the United States with many institutions willing to keep collections on designed landscapes of the recent past (Birnbaum, 1999a). The Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) of the National Park Service (2008a) also started to document sites from the recent past. While practitioners’ records and archives do occasionally end up in specialist libraries and public collections, many are retained in private archives of or at the practices. For example, the papers of Russell Page (Lambert et al., 1995) were acquired by the Kalmthout Arboretum in Belgium, the René Pechère Library (2008) in Belgium was inspired by Pechère’s work and records.
From the research we noted that a key role is also played by academic institutions as many acquire practitioners archives. The University of Edinburgh has a special collection of drawings and papers by Frank Clark, who also lectured at the University during his career. In the United States the University of Pennsylvania holds the designers’ records of Lawrence Halprin, George E. Patton, and Philip N. Winslow. Harvard Graduate School of Design houses a large proportion of Dan Kiley’s office collection (Birnbaum, 1999a) and the archives of Thomas Church are kept at the University of California at Berkeley (Birnbaum, 1999a). Dumbarton Oaks (2008) has started a ‘Contemporary Landscape Design Collection’ to collect documentation on twenty-two designers from across the world, many still active within landscape design. The collection holds part of the practitioners’ office records of for example Ian Hamilton Finlay (Great Britain), Erik Dhont (Belgium), Mario Schjetnan (Mexico), Bernard Lassus (France), Yoshio Nakamura (Japan), Richard Haag (United States), and Fernando Chacel (Brazil) (Dumbarton Oaks, 2008). Building up easily accessible catalogues of these records would be most useful for the future study of this period.

7.3.3.2 Training and education

Thompson (1948) already foresaw two serious problems for the future of maintenance of designed landscapes. The first problem he saw was the commitment of authorities to spend sufficient money on the maintenance, and secondly he highlighted that there will be a need for a sufficient maintenance force, with the proper skills. He felt that these two elements were crucial to keep sites relevant for society, and to guarantee the success, appreciation and survival of these landscapes (Thomson, 1948). Learning initiatives are therefore essential to inform and educate people in all categories and disciplines that play a role in the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past.

The need for skilled professionals, in the gardens discipline, is now more than ever necessary, and the increasing shortage of skills poses a worrisome threat to the maintenance of many sites. In the United Kingdom a report from 2005 by E3 Marketing Limited confirmed the seriousness of the skills shortage (Fig. 41) (E3 Marketing Limited, 2005). The report mapped careers and skills needs of the botanic and historic gardens sector and showed that this industry is now ‘…at severe risk from an increasing shortage of vital skills; a danger that is exacerbated by an aging workforce and problems centred around the difficulties of finding and helping to fund training....’
Andrew Colquhoun, Director General of the Royal Horticultural Society, described the size of the problem by saying that ‘…there’s a skills problem across the board, whether it’s finding someone to work in your back garden or to tend historic and botanical gardens….’ (Smith, 2005).

The measures of the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000) also recognise this trend and highlight the need for training and education. The Convention asks national parties to promote:

a. Training for specialists in landscape appraisal and operations.

b. Multidisciplinary training programmes in landscape policy, protection, management and planning, for professionals in the private and public sectors and for associations concerned.
c. School and university courses which, in the relevant subject areas, address the values attaching to landscapes and the issues raised by their protection, management and planning.

The conclusions from the report on skill by E3 Marketing Limited (2005) and the recommendations from the European Landscape Convention motivated leading horticultural organisations to establish in the United Kingdom a partnership to address the sector’s skills problems. A Green Skills Summit was held in April 2005 at which the partners committed to eight aims (Lantra, 2005):

- to influence the development and implementation of General Certificates of Secondary Education (GCSEs) in Science
- to increase the availability of apprenticeship schemes
- to establish cooperative careers information and marketing
- to provide career development for those changing careers
- to provide career structures and competences at craft and managerial levels
- to establish a single voice on all skills, education and careers issues
- to provide clear information on qualifications and learning pathways
- to build employer support for training

Successes that sprouted from the initiative include a successful bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund for support towards a four-year Historic and Botanic Garden Bursary Scheme (2008). The establishment of the Green Skills Careers Marketing Initiative (Felton, 2007) is another outcome. The Landscape Institute also launched in 2008 in the United Kingdom a similar initiative to attract interest in the profession of landscape architecture. Their campaign can be found online campaign under the title ‘I want to be a landscape architect’ (Landscape Institute, 2008b). The need for action within this area was also highlighted in the Heritage Protection Review White Paper, which said that ‘…English Heritage will implement a new programme of training, support and capacity building for English local authorities and local heritage organisations…’ (Department of Culture, Media and Sport and Welsh Assembly Government, 2007). An initiative that was launched by English Heritage (2008c) in the wake of this is the Historic Environment Traineeship Scheme, providing up to ten traineeships annually.

From the above it is clear that there is still a need to attract new professionals and for more training opportunities. The mentioned initiatives that were recently established
must be applauded but efforts must be made to ensure that these initiatives benefit
designed landscapes from all time periods, including from the recent past. When
working towards the eight aims that were agreed at the Green Skills Summit (Lantra,
2005), stakeholders must keep this in mind. The analysis of training activities that
occurred since 2000 showed that there is still much room for progress. It became
evident that amongst the large number of learning programmes that occur, there are
only few that focus specifically on the subject of the significant sites from the recent
past. Most existing training provides general training in horticultural skills, landscaping,
and conservation. Many of the general principles and methods taught at these courses
form though a sound basis for the variety of work that is required for the conservation
of designed landscapes of the recent past, but a greater attention to the subject would
help the conservation of these sites.

The types of initiatives that could be found on recent past subjects included academic
research projects, special workshops, conferences and seminars. The conferences
and seminars that were mentioned under other headings or previous chapters all must
be seen as valuable training opportunities. To avoid duplication these events are not
again listed here. The assessment of events show that in the United Kingdom most of
the training events relating to the recent past were again buildings oriented. Academic
institutions and key non-governmental organisations played a key role and every year
a steady number of training events could be observed. For example in 2002-03 the
events included a session on ‘The unbuttoning of modern’ at Meyerscough College,
Lancashire (Little, 2002); a lecture series on ‘Britain and the modern movement’ at the
School of Architecture of the University of Bath (2002); a seminar on ‘The Man-
made Future: Planning and Design in the mid-20th Century’ at the University of Edinburgh
(2003); a conference on ‘Conserving our Recent Past’ at the School of Conservation
Sciences at the University of Bournemouth (Geological Society, 2003), and the ‘Visions
Revisited’ conference in 2002 by the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland and the
Scottish Civic Trust (McDowell, 2004).

In comparison only few training initiatives appeared to have been organised with a
specific focus on the history and conservation of significant landscapes of the recent
past. Amongst these events are the two post war gardens workshops in 2002 held by
Garden History Society and the Association of Gardens Trusts (Brooks, 2002; Little,
2002), with an emphasis on the garden history and period. In 2003 The National Trust
organised in conjunction with Ashridge (2003) a six-day Garden History Summer School on Twentieth Century gardens with sessions on their designers (Waymark, 2003a), planting (van Groeningen, 2003) and conservation (Wheeler, 2003). The subject area at this event was not restricted to the post war period and there was some attention paid to the conservation aspects. All these training initiatives enable sharing of understanding and experience and conservation practice. The annual conference of the European Council of Landscape Architecture Schools (2003) was also addressing in 2003 the subject of ‘Landscape Architecture and modernism: Exploring the heritage and learning the lessons’. These initiatives indicated that the subject was gaining attention in the United Kingdom and Europe, but the general impression remained that too few landscape related training initiatives occurred.

![Image of Cultural Landscape Foundation](image)

Fig. 42: ‘Stewardship through Education’ and the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2006c).

In the United States the trend appeared to be similar also with many more buildings related events, but nevertheless it appeared that there was more of a momentum developing in the United States on the subject of landscapes. Since 2003 it seems that
in particular the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2004) has continued to develop many worthwhile initiatives, this under their 'Stewardship through Education' mission (Fig. 42). For example, their ‘Cultural Landscapes as Classrooms’ programme, primarily for middle school classroom education, aims to teach people to read the landscape through multimedia exploration. Interactive maps, audio narratives, and virtual journeys are available on CD-ROMs and their website (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2008a).

In the United Kingdom some documentation does exist to enable the use of gardens as a classroom, but what makes the ‘Cultural Landscapes as Classrooms’ programme stand out within the context of this research, is that landscapes of the recent past are used as an educational asset. For example, one of the themes used in the programme is ‘Icons of Modernism: The Donnell and Miller Garden’ (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2008b).

Fig. 43: Constructing the Swiss Landscape at Harvard University Graduate School of Design, 2006 (Author’s photograph).

Another example from the United States that can inspire more educational activities in the United Kingdom is the work by the Recent Past Preservation Network. Their aims include providing educational packages, lesson plans, lecture material, scholarships
and funding for research (Recent Past Preservation Network, 2003c). In the meantime academic institutions continued to explore the theme. Harvard University’s Graduate School of Design (2006) has a strong reputation in cutting edge work and they again were part of setting the trend in the renewed interest in landscapes from the recent past. A good example is their seminar and exhibition on ‘Constructing the Swiss Landscape’ in 2006, curated by Dorothy Imbert, who was mentioned before for her work on French modernist gardens (Imbert, 2003) (Fig. 43).

Initiatives exist in the United Kingdom but they do not yet appear to be making enough impact and more needs to be done to achieve the aims of the European Landscape Convention in relation to training and education. Lessons can be learned from approaches in other countries. Cooperation and exchange of knowledge can be a way to make swift progress and this also in the spirit of the European Landscape Convention’s aims under participation and cooperation.

### 7.3.3.3 Landscape quality objectives

The aims of the European Landscape Convention highlight the need to promote landscape management, which is defined in the Convention as ‘…action, from a perspective of sustainable development, to ensure the regular upkeep of a landscape, so as to guide and harmonise changes which are brought about by social, economic and environmental processes…’ (Council of Europe, 2000). The Convention also asks competent public authorities to formulate landscape quality objectives, meaning ‘…the aspirations of the public with regard to the landscape features of their surroundings…’ (Council of Europe, 2000).

Earlier in this study it was already made clear, through the examples in Chapter Five on the continuing destruction and disfigurement of significant sites, that in many cases the management of sites remains inadequate. The already mentioned case of Harlow Water Gardens remains within this context one of the best examples in the United Kingdom of how subjective the decisions regarding quality objectives and the management of sites can be. Harlow Water Gardens was a listed site but nevertheless the local authorities gave approval for relocation of the site, resulting in a de-listing.

While there are reasons for concern for the conservation of sites, there are also many examples of sites that are being well cared for, such as for example in the case of
many privately owned and managed properties such as Portrack, Scotland (Fig. 27), the garden of Charles Jencks (2003). In the United Kingdom there are several cases were charitable organisations have taken on the management of sites or even special Trusts have been established to look after one particular site. The Little Sparta Trust (2008) was founded on 4 May 1995 to take on the management of Little Sparta (Sheeler, 2008), Ian Hamilton Finlay’s garden in Scotland (Fig. 26 and Fig. 45). Similarly the Gibberd Garden Trust (2008) was founded after Sir Frederick Gibberd’s death to safeguarding his garden in Harlow (Fig. 44).

Fig. 44: Sir Frederick Gibberd’s private garden in Harlow New Town (Author’s photograph).

Some charitable organisations that took on the management of designed landscapes have even been responsible for creating added layers of significant designed landscape elements to such sites. In such circumstances they often not only created the new landscape elements but also remain responsible for the management. The National Trust for Scotland (2008b) for example created in the 1950s the new formal parterres in Pitmedden Garden in Aberdeenshire (Fig. 50), an excellent example of a garden from the recent past but in a traditional design style. The Trust also constructed
since 1945 several new visitor centres with new landscaping features at its properties, such as at the Bannockburn Battlefield Heritage Site where new visitor facilities were erected in a modernist fashion in the 1960s (Fig. 22) (Wemyss, 1962).

A factor that emerged from the study was that at times organisations that had added such layers, such as the National Trust for Scotland, and continue to look after these sites, appear themselves not fully aware of the significance of the elements of recent past at these sites or the features that these organisations had added themselves to the sites. Such features are often dismissed as not being historic or of significance and resulting at times in poor upkeep and management. Similarly it became clear that landscape professionals and specialists often remain ignorant and unaware of the recent past. This is of particular concern because landscape professionals should play a key role in management guidance and increasing awareness. If they do not make the difference, questions remain about who will do the shouting (Hird, 2001). Birnbaum also raised this as a concern and questioned ‘…why aren’t landscape architects speaking out about the impending destruction of modernist masterpieces?...’ (Birnbaum, 2003c). In the United States suggestions were already put forward in the mid-1990s that Professional Membership Organisations should start to play a more active role. Birnbaum (1999a) and Haag (1999) both suggested already in 1995, at the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture conference, that the American Society of Landscape Architects and the Landscape Architecture Foundation should formulate and develop a national strategy through a committee of experts. Not much action towards this appeared to have occurred over the following years and in response the delegates at the 2002 conference on the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture reiterated their concern by formulating the Wave Hill Charter on the Preservation of Modern Landscape Architecture (Fig. 10). In the Charter they urge the American Society of Landscape Architects to develop ‘…national guidance and ethics regarding the ongoing preservation and management of national significant works of landscape architecture from the recent past….before it is too late’ (Birnbaum et al., 2004). By 2008 the American Society of Landscape Architects had seventeen special forums, or Professional Practice Networks, on various themes. One of these is the Historic Preservation Professional Practice Network (2008), however there was in 2008 still no dedicated expert committee or network on landscapes of the recent past. In the United Kingdom a dedicated expert committee does not appear to exist in the Professional Membership organisations. In comparison, and more positively, ICOMOS (2008a) now
has its dedicated International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage, which was mentioned under stakeholders that act at an international level. The research also already concluded that this scientific committee still failed to focus on landscapes of the recent past. Nevertheless, professional membership organisations within landscape architecture should consider following ICOMOS’ example. These issues demand however to be looked at in more depth later in the research and this will be done as part of the case study surveys as this will assist with verifying the situation at sites.

In relation to the management of sites and the setting out of landscape quality objectives several international conservation charters, such as the ICOMOS Burra Charter (ICOMOS Australia, 1999), highlight the importance of the preparation of a conservation policy and its implementation through management plans. In the United Kingdom good examples could be found from the late 1990s and after 2000 of conservation management plans for landscapes of the recent past that establish landscape objectives and a vision for their management. The work done by Land Use Consultants on the preparation of historic landscape surveys and conservation visions
for the garden at Sanderson Hotel Courtyard, London (Land Use Consultants, 1998), the Gibberd Garden, Harlow (Fig. 44) (Land Use Consultants, 1997), and Turn End, Haddenham (Cole, 2001) illustrates well how existing conservation methodologies and principles can easily be applied to designed landscapes of the recent past. The process of preparation of these reports included public consultation and resulted in overviews of the history of the sites, an analysis and assessment of their significance, and a vision and management plan for the future. With the availability of these plans it is hoped that these sites can be safeguarded.

Nevertheless many significant sites in the United Kingdom still encounter ongoing problems with the establishment of management objectives, this even when they are listed on government’s inventories of significant sites. The example of Little Sparta can be given here. The Little Sparta Trust already used John Richards for landscape advice (Personal communication, August 17, 2006), but no conservation management plan was yet developed. Little Sparta does, however, feature on the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes prepared by Historic Scotland (2007c) and matched funding can be requested for the preparation of a conservation management plan (Historic Scotland, 2008g). For small charities the problem remains at times to cover the costs of their own match funding. This will again be verified further through the case study surveys.

In other cases conservation management planning is less a financial concern, but rather seen as a bothersome exercise that may result in limitations for development. This can be illustrated by the proposed redevelopment of the Bannockburn Battlefield Heritage Centre and 1960s landscape concept (Kliskey, 2004). The 2004 plans proposed the demolition of the 1960s concept but no thorough assessment of significance had occurred by 2004 of the features of the recent past and no conservation management plan had been written up (Haenraets, 2008). The 2004 proposals ultimately did not gain support and a new proposal now needs to be developed.

Lessons should though be learned from successful projects, including those within the context of built architecture from the recent past. For instance Avanti Architects (2008) have been involved in many successful conservation projects of modern buildings, ranging from Lubetkin’s Penguin Pools at the London Zoo (Allan, 2002b) or the
regeneration of the social housing of Wynford House in the London Borough of Islington (Allan, 2001). Practical experiences in regeneration of urban housing (Allan 1998) or the preservation dilemmas (Allan, 2002a) were published by Allan and provide most valuable in-sight knowledge to help develop conservation practice. The work by practices such as Land Use Consultants and Avanti Architects are examples that can help set the standards for other consultancy practices and professional membership organisations.

A general conclusion that can be made here is that it is clear that the subject of the management of sites can benefit much from more research through the use of the case study surveys. This will be explored in depth in the next chapters.

7.3.3.4 Cooperation and joint policies

Another key aim of the European Landscape Convention is to encourage state parties to organise international cooperation. In addition to cooperation the Convention also asks for procedures for ‘…the participation of the general public, local and regional authorities, and other parties…’ (Council of Europe, 2000). With these objectives the Convention also follows the wider opinion that new partners for historic preservation ‘…will be ultimately, what determines its success and failure in the future…’ (Wray, 1995). A similar recommendation was also given by Birnbaum (1999a) when he underlined the importance of establishing creative partnerships.

In general, most conservation organisations actively work in partnership with others and are engaged in networking. Several examples of partnerships amongst various stakeholders were already given under various subjects discussed before. However, as there are only few organisations that focus strongly on the conservation of landscapes of the recent past, there is still much scope for enhancing conservation practice through partnerships and involvement. A number of examples of cooperation and involvement that were noted in the analysis are mentioned hereafter to illustrate some shortcomings and potential areas for improvement.

Sharing experiences and case studies remains a most significant way to spread knowledge and improve conservation. The internet also proves a most useful medium for this purpose with several charitable organisations already posting useful case studies online to raise awareness, concerns, and to share experiences. In the United
Kingdom the Twentieth Century Society (2008d) is involved in casework and publishes some reports online (Twentieth Century Society, 2008c). Their work focuses though mainly on buildings and there is in the United Kingdom still a need for similar work to appear online for landscapes of the recent past. In contrast, in the United States the Cultural Landscape Foundation already places online case studies under its ‘Features’ and ‘Landslides – Landscapes at risk’ pages. Studies on several sites include the rehabilitation of Robert Royston’s Modernist play area in Palo Alto, California (Pearson, 2003), Dan Kiley’s Nations Bank Plaza Park in Tampa, Florida (Schaudt, 2003), or Lawrence Halprin’s United Nations Plaza in San Francisco (Chappell, 2004). The ‘Case Study Corner’ of the Recent Past Preservation Network (2005b) in the United States on the other hand also covers mainly buildings and could also start highlighting landscapes.

For campaigning purposes the internet also has become most efficient. Petition pages, online bulletin boards or blog pages all assist actions. Good examples could be found in the United States where again the Recent Past Preservation Network (2003a; 2003b) and the Los Angeles Conservancy Modern Committee (2003) have launched several online petitions to enable grassroots participation. The Cultural Landscape Foundation continue to publish frequent articles and papers online with stories of interest (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2008h), often to assist with campaigning for the protection of sites. In the United Kingdom the Twentieth Century Society (2002) publishes a monthly article online on its ‘Building of the Month’ page. This is often used to raise awareness about threats to sites, such as in the case of the Harlow Water Gardens (Fig. 3).

Cooperation often does not need to be overly complex and an impact can be made even through working together at a particular event. Conferences most frequently result from partnership initiatives, but even collaboration in sessions at such events can be worthwhile. At the National Preservation Conference of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (2006) in Pittsburgh three sessions focussed on preserving the recent past and brought architects, historians, landscape architects and conservation practitioners together in eye-opening sessions. The ‘Informed Decisions in the Material World’ session brought together speakers from DOCOMOMO United States, the Cultural Landscape Foundation, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The session on ‘Misfits of Modernism’ aimed to raise awareness of the issues by portraying
in an ironical way the cases of some sites at risk. The National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Recent Past Preservation Network played an active role in this session. The National Trust for Historic Preservation (2006) also chaired an inspiring ‘Recent Past Toolbox’ session, which brought speakers from other sessions on the recent past together with an aim to share experiences and resources for the benefit of attendees.

In the United Kingdom an initiative whereby several organisations are based in a shared office is an ideal tool for establishing close links. This remarkable initiative of cooperation occurs at Cowcross Street, London, where several charities, including the Twentieth Century Society, DOCOMOMO United Kingdom, and the Garden History Society, are offered office spaces by the architectural firm of Alan Baxter and Associates Architects (2008). In the United States many organisations rely on corporate partners for support with their key activities. Each year the Cultural Landscape Foundation appears to receive over $200,000 of in-kind resources from corporate partners to assist the development of programs (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2004). This format of partnership working seems to remain unexplored in the United Kingdom for the purpose of the conservation of landscapes of the recent past.

With such expertise at the Cultural Landscape Foundation potentially there is a possibility to use similar models for other countries and to establish an international network. DOCOMOMO International has for example succeeded through its network of fifty-two National Working Parties (DOCOMOMO International, 2008d) in exporting expertise across the world. The Recent Past Preservation Network (2003d) also aims to function as a networking platform but again appears to restrict its main activities to the United States. The European Council of Landscape Architecture Schools (2003) and the LE:NOTRE network project (2008) provide potentially in Europe and academic network through which knowledge on landscapes of the recent past and their conservation can be spread. The LE:NOTRE Project already links over one hundred European universities with stakeholder organisations with interests in landscape architecture teaching and research. The European Urban Landscape Partnership (2008) is a new key initiatives of the Thematic Network Dissemination Project by LE:NOTRE PLUS (2008), and could also become a key player, if the subject of conservation and the recent past could be pushed onto their agenda.
This raises the issue that there is still a need for more interaction and cooperation within the different strands of landscape professions. Most importantly, landscape conservation professionals and landscape designers often appear to be working in two separate vacuums, as two separately operating disciplines. Landscape architecture tends to be a creative profession and less concerned with conservation. Landscape design students seem to still receive too limited landscape conservation modules as part of their training. Landscape specialists as a result frequently cause irreversible damage to significant landscape architecture. The case studies that will follow in the next chapters will look closer into this, but it is clear that initiatives such as the LE:NOTRE Project can make important contributions towards addressing such issues within and help to bridge gaps between professionals.

7.3.3.5 Participation

In the case of landscape professionals, one frustration that was noted in relation to involvement was the frequent absence in redevelopment projects of consultation with the original designers. Halprin (2003) spoke out about the importance of involving, were still possible, the original designers in the preservation process and voiced how many designers were upset about being overlooked. Given the fact that many significant designers are now of a veteran age, there are still unique opportunities for recording their own stories. Involving such designers in conferences creates good opportunities to appreciate their views. The second Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture conference succeeded in having several landscape architects that created some of the most celebrated works of the period as speakers. For example M. Paul Friedberg (2004), Lawrence Halprin (2004), and Donald Richardson (2004) all shared their recollections about the origin of their works and their opinions on the future of these sites. It must be remembered that the original designers frequently have strong views about the preservation or loss of some sites. Halprin (2004), for example, highlighted that not everything is worthy of preservation and has his own ideas about the values that should be taken into consideration when making decisions. Olin also agreed that we should ‘preserve some, yes, but improve, add to, and let some go’ (Olin, 2004).

The decision-making processes of conservation and landscape planning must obviously include the wider public. It is clear that public participation and consultation already feature high on the agendas of governmental and non-governmental bodies.
English Heritage’s booklet The Power of Place’ ‘describes how people want to be involved, but are all too often excluded and remain powerless, this while every person has a duty as well a right to know and participate (English Heritage, 2000). In the Power of Place a statement is made that ‘…if the barriers to involvement can be overcome, the historic environment has the potential to strengthen the sense of community and provide a solid basis for neighbourhood renewal. This is the power of place….’. (English Heritage, 2000).

It must, therefore, also be concluded that the wider public and volunteers can make a most significant contribution towards enhancing awareness and conservation practice of landscapes of the recent past. In previous chapters many initiatives that were successful through public involvement have been mentioned. For example volunteers played a key part in compiling several inventories. A further good example is the online collaborative research by the Garden History Society (2003b) in the United Kingdom to compile a history of post war gardens (Fig. 13). This initiative was established with the aim of receiving online contributions from members, volunteers and the wider public. Many opportunities that can benefit landscapes of the recent past appear nevertheless unexplored and lessons can yet again be learned from initiatives on buildings related subjects and from abroad. The Recent Past Preservation Network recommends, for example, volunteer involvement for preparing nominations for registers, keeping local forums and bulletin boards, coordinating on-line petition pages, preparing lists and documentation on sites at risk, writing editorial pieces and letters, collecting images, assisting with a research library or archive, assisting with databases, website development and maintenance, examining case studies, membership recruiting, networking and so on (Recent Past Preservation Network, 2003f).

7.3.3.6 Awareness-raising

The European Landscape Convention included awareness-raising as the first specific measure it mentions. The Convention asks all State Parties to undertake actions ‘…to increase awareness among the civil society, private organisations, and public authorities of the value of landscapes, their role and changes to them…’ (Council of Europe, 2000). The Oxford Concise Dictionary describes ‘aware’ as ‘…conscious, not ignorant, having knowledge, well informed….’ (Thompson, 1996). In Sagan’s introduction to Hawking’s book ‘A Brief History of Time’ he talks about awareness when saying that ‘...we go about our daily lives understanding almost nothing of the world....’
(Sagan, 1995). The same could be said about our historic environment, we live in it, alter it, but know little about its origins or meanings. In other words, many people do not seem to be aware of the landscape they inhabit. The Oxford Declaration on Landscape describes awareness of landscape ‘…as an asset to local communities, from which they can benefit through knowledge, use and enjoyment…’ (ICOMOS UK, 2000). The landscape we live in can provide people with an understanding about their origins and community and how the future might evolve (National Trust, 2000b).

Haenraets (2001) concluded that there are numerous ways of raising awareness and listed a number of important types of activities that help with improving awareness of historic landscapes and the historic environment:

- Community participation
- Creating leadership
- Developing knowledge
- Improving the interdisciplinary and integrated approach
- Establishing academic courses, professional training and professional recognition
- Establishing supportive networks

Haenraets (2001) also noted that raising awareness involves two main groups, which he named the ‘interest groups’ and the ‘promoters’, and which to a degree overlap. Under interest groups Haenraets listed:

- Politicians and decision makers
- Investors and promoters
- Administrators and property owners
- Children
- Young people and students
- The general public

Jokilehto points out that the entire community should be made aware, and especially decision-makers (Jokilehto, 1996). English Heritage mentions leadership together with knowledge as the two preconditions for a better care for the historic environment and that ‘…the government should lead by example…’ (English Heritage, 2000).
Johnston (1989) formulated a classification for a hierarchy for the power structure within the cultural heritage sector:

- Politicians
- Government bureaucrats
- Local governments
- Consultants
- Voluntary conservation groups
- The community

All such bodies should work together as ‘promoters’ in the process of raising awareness (Haenraets, 2001). Individuals with expert knowledge, such as authors, photographers, or owners can also be a very influential group. Raising awareness must also occur at different levels of action, ranging from individuals acting at local level to larger global initiatives. Of importance is also that raising awareness should be continuous long-term processes that requiring a well-planned and harmonious approach at all levels of society (Haenraets, 2001).

There are clearly endless ways of raising awareness. Many initiatives that focus on specialist audiences make major contributions, such as the already mentioned research projects, inventory work, conservation charters, training events, conferences and so on. Specialists involved in conservation projects must not forget that the projects themselves offer excellent opportunities for raising awareness (Haenraets, 2001). Other initiatives are targeted towards wider audiences, such as many of the publications that were already described. It has been of interest that some exhibitions and open days were started to promote the subject to larger audiences. In the United Kingdom the exhibition on the ‘Art of the Garden’ in 2004 at the Tate Britain (Postle et al., 2004) included displays on the gardens of the post war garden artists Barbara Hepworth, Derek Jarman, and Ian Hamilton Finlay (Fig. 46) and reached new audiences. The idea of a virtual exhibition as developed by the French Ministry of Culture and Communication (1996) on ‘1000 Monuments du XXe siecle’, in conjunction with a book (Smith and Chaudesaigues, 1997) should also further be explored in the United Kingdom. Similarly the first nation-wide Modern Gardens Open Day was organised on 26 June 2004 in the United Kingdom with the support of English Heritage and the Association of Garden Trusts (Richardson, 2004). The organisers wanted to open eyes and show that these gardens are an intrinsic part of our tradition and not
just some ‘…trendy flash in the pan…’ (Anderton, 2004). The day was not repeated but the idea of open days certainly should be explored more in the future.

Fig. 46: Art of the Garden Exhibition 2004 (Tate Britain, 2004).

A key conclusion is therefore that nearly all the initiatives mentioned so far in the study to a certain degree make a contribution towards raising awareness. It is, however, difficult to estimate how much progress has been achieved concerning raising awareness on the subject of designed landscapes of the recent past and their conservation. Answering this question would potentially require a doctoral research in itself. The conclusion that can be made from this research is that there has been an increase of initiatives on the subject of designed landscapes of the recent past, and that some progress has been made towards achieving the aims of recommendations such as those of the European Landscape Convention.

A second conclusion must nevertheless be that on the basis of the findings presented in other chapters, in particular in Chapter Five on Inventories and Chapter Four on the continuing destruction and disfigurement of significant sites, that still much progress regarding awareness is required. Lessons must therefore be learned from existing initiatives to assist in developing more and continuous, or more efficient initiatives.
7.3.3.7 Protection and legislation

The current state of inventories and registers was explored in Chapter Six and to avoid duplication the same information was not repeated in this chapter. Key conclusions were therefore given in Chapter Six. A general observation is that there needs to be better statutory protection and control for significant sites of the recent past and work to document and list landscapes of the recent past is lagging behind in comparison to achievements and protection for buildings.

7.3.3.8 Implementation

The European Landscape Convention highlights the need of implementation by state parties of the measures of the convention. The findings of Chapters Five, Six, and Seven all provide in-sight in relation to the work done by key stakeholders to implement the actions. Clearly, with significant shortcomings and continuing damage to sites, the overarching impression is that implementation is still far from ideal. The conclusions under the other headings provide further insight about the shortcomings in implementation.

7.4 Conclusions

The findings that were summarised above further corroborated and validated the conclusions from the literature review in Chapter Two, and provided further insight in relation to progress made against existing recommendations for measures, such as from the European Landscape Convention, or as illustrated in the overview of existing recommendations in Table 2.1 in Appendix 1. To allow cross-examination with earlier findings, the key conclusions from the analysis in this chapter will therefore be summarised under two headings:

1. Conclusions in relation to the headings (A to M) of recommended areas for action as given in Table 2.1 in Appendix 1.
2. General conclusions in relation to initiatives by stakeholders.

7.4.1 Conclusions in relation to the existing recommendations

The following conclusions are summarised using the main headings (A to M) of areas for recommended action in from the conclusions of Chapter Two and Table 2.1 in Appendix 1.
A. Survey, analysis and evaluation of sites

With landscapes of recent past still being poorly recognised, the importance of proper recording and documenting remains essential. The survey indicated that in the United Kingdom far too little initiatives have focused on this and that only few sites feature on inventories. There is still a clear need to better understand the importance of this heritage and the variety of sites. It appears that in the United States several initiatives have been undertaken to build up archives and collections on designed landscapes of the recent past, which could inspire similar action in the United Kingdom. An example is the recording of oral histories undertaken by the Cultural Landscape Foundation. In the case of designers of recent times there is still the unique opportunity to record their personal accounts and technologies are now available to do this easily. With many designers from the post war period reaching senior ages, this aspect should be prioritised.

B. Legal protection and listing

The subject of inventories was covered in detail in Chapter Six and key conclusions were given at the end of that chapter. The analysis in Chapter Seven further validated these findings and it was again confirmed that important lessons can be learned from the practice in the United States. It was noted that initiatives relating to the conservation of recent past heritage were in the United States in many cases taken forward circa ten years prior to similar initiatives in the United Kingdom. For example, in Chapter Six it became evident that in the United States legislation to allow statutory protection for built heritage from the recent past was in place by 1980 (Sherfy and Luce, 1998), almost ten years ahead of England (Page, 1992) and guidelines by the Council of Europe (1991), and even fifteen years before similar initiatives by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (UNESCO, 1994). The United States government also announced in 2003 a Historic Rehabilitation Tax Incentives for owners of buildings of the recent past (Kelly, 2003), which also applies to designed landscapes (National Register of Historic Places, 2008b).

C. Management and maintenance programmes of sites

Several issues in relation to the implementation of management and maintenance were specifically covered in Chapter Five where concerns were raised about the ongoing
damage to significant sites and the fact that stakeholders do not always apply existing 
conservation principles to the management and maintenance and decision-making 
processes. However, it must also be acknowledged that many stakeholders undertake 
excellent maintenance of sites and aim to do so by using conservation management 
plans. Many significant sites, including listed sites, continue to struggle, often due to 
shortage of funding.

Remarkable is that some conservation organisations which created new layers of 
landscape design in the recent past in historic sites, often overlook the significance of 
these layers. When redevelopment is required at sites, an assessment of significance 
of these layers is frequently not done. Similarly, landscape professionals often remain 
ignorant and unaware of the importance of features of the recent past. A concern is 
that if landscape architects do not promote, or protect sufficiently, these sites that 
others may not do so either. To address this, there were calls to see committee of 
experts established that focus on the subject, within professional landscape 
architecture membership organisations. The findings of the case study survey in 
Chapter Eight will allow further verification of these conclusions.

D. Promotion, Raising Awareness and Communication

Slowly interest is increasing for the subject but with major shortcomings in the 
documentation, protection and treatment of these landscapes there is still an urgent 
need to increase awareness and recognition. It is positive that some initiatives have 
been organised and that more publications have become available on the subject of 
landscape architecture of the recent past and that these have started to highlight the 
historic importance of designed landscapes from the recent past. With several 
architects and landscape architects now being recognised as iconic designers, and 
certain sites and buildings being appreciated as masterpieces, publishers have also 
increased the number of publications on the subject. In particular Modernist 
architecture has become a popular subject for books now that sufficient time has 
elapsed for this heritage to become more appreciated. Of interest is also that 
Modernism has become again a strong influence and inspiration for present day 
designers.

This has contributed to an increased awareness and recognition of sites from this 
period but in general too many sites remain at risk and are being damaged. Many more
initiatives must therefore be undertaken by all stakeholder groups to increase awareness. It is clear that experts and professional membership organisations have started to speak up about the significance of these landscapes but there is an ongoing need for landscape professionals to promote the value of landscapes from the recent past and their work.

**E. Understanding technological and material challenges**

Much documentation has been developed by governmental and non-governmental bodies, including publishers, on technologies and materials used in buildings of the recent past. While many of these technologies also apply to hard landscaping and landscape architectural structures, a gap appears to exist when it comes to similar studies on the subject of specific landscape design materials, conservation practice and conservation methodologies for these landscapes.

**F. Understanding the wider context of landscape architecture of the recent past**

Closely relating to survey and documenting is the need to enhance our understanding of the wider context. In general more publications on the subject of the recent past have become available, often through thematic research undertaken by various stakeholders. Similarly more documentation became available on designed landscapes of the recent past and landscape architecture in general. Research into the architecture of the recent past remains however strongly focussed on the buildings from this era, rather than landscape architecture. Similarly the theory and history of landscapes of the recent past architecture receives most attention, with few studies looking into the conservation aspects and technological challenges.

**G. Use of established methods and principles**

In the analysis several examples could be observed of good conservation practice. A key conclusion is that existing conservation methodologies are suitable for sites of all periods, including of the recent past. Where poor conservation practice was observed standard conservation principles were being ignored. Those involved in the conservation of sites must therefore be stimulated to apply existing methodologies and principles to their conservation actions for sites of the recent past.
H. Cooperation and partnerships

The need for cooperation and partnership initiatives was highlighted in the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000) and the survey showed several examples of initiatives under this heading. Nevertheless only a limited number of initiatives were found that relate to the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past, and therefore it is clear that much progress still needs to be made in this area. Addressing shortcomings, cooperation and participation can be a very useful tool to increase the number of initiatives that support the conservation of sites. Similarly cooperation can help with improving conservation practice through the exchange of knowledge and experiences. For example, more cooperation between governmental and non-governmental organisations appears needed, and interdisciplinary cooperation is advisable, for example given that many lessons can be learned from the experiences in conserving buildings from the recent past. The discipline of landscape design should also develop closer links with the discipline of landscape conservation to avoid both working in isolation. This would enable a sharing of experiences and understanding of each other’s fields. Cooperation can also lead towards more consistency of approaches. For example the governmental approaches in Scotland and England towards heritage protection vary greatly.

International cooperation and partnerships must also be further explored, as highlighted in the European Landscape Convention, but should not be limited to Europe. For example, it is clear that governmental and non-governmental organisations in the United Kingdom should look closer at the developments in the United States. Action in the United States on landscapes of the recent past also still restricted and must increase, but nevertheless it appears that in the United States the conservation of the recent past seems to receive more attention and progress appears to happen steadily. In comparison to the United States there are in the United Kingdom less dedicated governmental bodies involved in the conservation of historic landscapes and the recent past. English Heritage has undertaken a number of initiatives, but Scotland needs a strong governmental agency or department to address all the aspects of conservation of designed landscapes, as Historic Scotland fails to cover this area sufficiently. There are in particular few non-governmental organisations in the United Kingdom with a specific mission to address the conservation of designed landscapes from the recent past. The Cultural Landscape Foundation which is active in
the United States remains unique and a similar initiative would be beneficial in the United Kingdom.

I. Development of national strategies
The lack of sufficient dedicated initiatives at governmental level in the United Kingdom towards the protection and conservation of landscapes of the recent past highlights the need for a clear national strategy to address the shortcomings and issues. In the United States the government established a designated programme (Recent Past Initiative, 2008) that indicates a national approach and coordination, but no similar initiatives exist in the United Kingdom. Non-governmental organisations such as the Twentieth Century Society have their strategic objectives, but again proper strategies for landscapes remain absent.

J. Monitor and record keeping
The importance of documenting has been highlighted, but similarly retaining archives of documentation is essential. The study demonstrated that in general many archives and depositories exist, but more initiatives to also establish special collections on landscapes of the recent past are needed and should be encouraged. A clear overview of available resources and access to documentation remains an issue.

K. Consultation and participation
The analysis showed that several initiatives have been taken forward through involvement of the wider public, such as was the case with volunteers who helped with compiling inventories in England. Nevertheless it appears that many opportunities for participation and involvement remain unexplored with examples from buildings related initiatives that can inspire similar practice for landscapes. It is clear that the wider public and volunteers can still make more significant contributions towards enhancing awareness and conservation of landscapes of the recent past. Consultation did occur, but appeared not to involve all stakeholders categories sufficiently, with the frequent absence of consultation with the original designer in redevelopment projects raised as a major concern. The case study survey will further assist in better understanding the main concerns about consultation and participation, as the survey investigates opinions and experiences by people involved in the management of sites, or members of the wider public that know the site.
L. Training and education
What became evident from the study was that amongst the large number of training and learning programmes there are very few activities that focus specifically on the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past. Existing courses do however provide general training in horticultural skills, landscaping and conservation, and the existing principles and methods are already a sound basis for the variety of work that is required for the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past. Nevertheless, special training with an emphasis on aspects of landscapes of the recent past would though greatly enhance practice at many levels and enable sharing of understanding and experience. Another threat to the maintenance of these sites in the United Kingdom is the developing skills shortages that have been identified within the horticultural and landscaping professions. The availability of training and pertinent courses becomes therefore even more urgent.

Another finding is that particularly in the United States more initiatives were undertaken from the 1990s onwards by academic institutions on the subject of the conservation of the recent past, than in Europe and the United Kingdom. Even less academic activities were set up on the subject of landscapes of the recent past and their conservation. Therefore lessons should be learned from the United States and from initiatives that focused on architecture from the recent past.

Finally it must be noted that there is still a major need to educate landscape and conservation professionals about this heritage. Due to lack of awareness and ignorance such professionals themselves have instigated frequently damage to significant sites. This can be tempered by training initiatives which can play a useful role in increasing recognition and awareness, for example by holding conferences, exhibitions, and lectures on the topic.

M. Funding
In the United Kingdom protection of significant designed landscapes remains an issue and without statutory protection limited governmental grants are available. The Heritage Lottery Fund schemes have offset this shortcoming to a degree, but can only give grants for a limited number of projects. Clear examples were observed where
protective measures are inadequate and result in sites being neglected or even damaged, such as seen in the case of Harlow Water Gardens.

7.4.2 General conclusions

In addition to the conclusions that relate to the headings for recommended action from the conclusions of Chapter Two and Table 2.1, as used above, a number of other general observations must be made.

Many initiatives exist, but significant gaps remain

The analysis showed that in the mid-1980s the first initiative on the subject of recent past heritage gained momentum and that since the 1990s much progress was made with several initiatives taken forward by diverse stakeholders. The two tables with overviews of key initiatives by stakeholders can be found in Appendix 4 and Appendix 5. A first major conclusion is nevertheless that there remain major shortcomings and ongoing efforts are still required, in particular in relation to landscapes of the recent past.

Many organisations play a role, but few have a strong focus on landscapes of the recent past

From the study it became clear that there are a large number of stakeholder organisations that are involved in the conservation of heritage from the recent past. The survey identified key organisations including a number of new organisations, which were founded and that contribute towards the conservation of the recent past. An important conclusion is however that few of these organisations deliver actions on the conservation of landscapes of the recent past and most focus strongly on buildings of the recent past. Of similar significance is that many key organisations within landscape architecture, history and conservation also only undertake sporadic initiatives on the subject of the recent past. Therefore existing organisations working within the conservation of designed landscapes should be encouraged to pay more attention to the subject of designed landscapes of the recent past and incorporate activities and objectives in their programmes. There is also a need for professional landscape architectural organisations to set up more activities that focus on the conservation of landscape heritage, as requested in the Wave Hill Charter from the Association of Landscape Architects in the United States (Birnbaum et al., 2004). The lack of expert
committees on landscapes of the recent past should also be tackled by professional membership organisations and they should establish such working groups.

International organisations such as ICOMOS or DOCOMOMO should also play a stronger role in motivating national organisations and governments to tackle some of the shortcomings. An important conclusion is sadly that several of these international organisations have prepared their own recommendations, including ICOMOS and DOCOMOMO, but they fail to deliver these aims when it comes down to the conservation and protection of designed landscapes of the recent past. More efforts must be made to incorporate for example landscapes into the work of the ICOMOS Twentieth Century Committee. At present such committees continue to have mainly buildings related aims. Rather than having to set up new special committees on designed landscapes, it is advisable to integrate landscape work in to existing committees’ and organisations’ activities.

An observation is also that it is beneficial when the objectives of an organisation are not limited to a particular historical period, as is the case for the Twentieth Century Society, which already changed its name from the Thirties Society. The advantage of organisations such as the Cultural Landscape Foundation and the Recent Past Preservation Network in the United States is that with the recent past continuously moving in history these organisations will remain relevant.

Many initiatives exist, but landscape related initiatives lag behind

The overview illustrated that a remarkable number of initiatives on recent past heritage subjects have taken place in the United Kingdom and internationally, but initiatives on the subject of the conservation of landscapes of the recent past was lagging behind, in particular when compared with progress made in the field of architecture of the recent past. While many initiatives and organisations have been set up with a mission to address the conservation of buildings from the recent past, relative few initiatives specifically address the conservation of designed landscapes from the recent past. In the United Kingdom government action towards the conservation of designed landscapes from the recent past only slowly gained a momentum in the early 2000s. By that date, good progress had already been made through government initiatives for post war buildings protection and their listing. When in 2002 English Heritage decided to disband its Post War Listing Steering Group this also meant indirectly a step
backwards for landscapes (Powers, 2008). In general conservation initiatives relating to landscapes of the recent past continue to lag behind and do not appear to receive the attention it deserves.

**A need for overviews of existing initiatives**
While many initiatives have been undertaken on the subject of landscapes of the recent past, the absence of clear and accessible overviews of existing initiatives and what has been achieved to date, does not assist the development of further actions and initiatives, or to assess how successful the implementation of recommendations has been to date. It is hoped that the overviews provided in this research can make a start towards addressing this problem.

**A need for overviews of who is doing what, and who should be doing what**
Overviews of relevant organisations that play a key role in the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past, and what roles they play assists action, and help to establish whether new organisations are needed. Again it is hoped that this research made a contribution towards resolving this issue.

From existing recommendations it is not always clear which stakeholders should take certain suggested actions forward at an international, national or local level. Haag (1999) argued that more suggestions could be given to inform specific disciplines on how to contribute to an enhancement of the conservation of landscapes of the recent past.

**Recommendations appear needed that are more site specific and of local relevance**
What became clear from the analysis is that existing recommendations mainly deal with the overarching context of policy, recognition, protection, research and planning. The recommendations tend to focus on the bigger picture and more attention could be paid to addressing issues at sites and local level. Many of the action points relate to international or national strategies, rather than the site-specific needs and local issues. When key recommendations are looked at from the perspective of those who are actively involved in the on-site conservation and development of these designed landscapes, have limited direct relevance to on-site challenges. For example, issues such as funding and consultation were only sporadically mentioned in these
recommendations, while at a local level funding is often a major concerns. It is crucial that there is a bottom up, and not only a top down approach to establishing recommendations for action. To inform such recommendations a clearer understanding of the issues from the perspective of those involved at sites is required. The case study survey of this research will assist in gathering such data.

Further research and cross-examination through the case study surveys
A most important general conclusion is that available data for the analysis covered well the stakeholder categories of governmental and non-governmental organisations, enterprises and publishers, training and educational institutions, and archives and repositories, but that data relating to the day to day management and maintenance programmes of sites, and the wider involvement of public and visitors through consultation and participation, remains insufficient. A finding is that to enable a more comprehensive understanding of these aspects there is a need for the practical case studies. As described in the research methodology the findings of these case studies will be summarised in the next chapter.
CHAPTER EIGHT

8 ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF THE CASE STUDY SURVEY

8.1 Introduction

In the research methodology it was explained that the findings of the literature review in Chapter Two required further validation, through further in-depth analysis of written resources and data and records on the subject, such as existing inventories, and the analysis of ongoing initiatives of key stakeholders. In the methodology it was also explained that cross-examining these findings with a case study survey was needed to validate findings and establish potential gaps in data. The case study survey is particularly required to provide in-depth data in relation to the day to day management of sites and the views of the wider public and visitors.

In Chapter Four the methodology for the case study survey was explained together with the statistical data on respondents, responses, and key themes of the responses. In the empirical analysis of this chapter the responses of the case study survey will be reviewed in-depth. The key findings of this analysis are presented using the ten headings of Table 4.8:

I. Awareness and recognition (8.2)
II. Concerns about the management and maintenance (8.3)
III. Concerns about finance and budgets (8.4)
IV. Challenges associated with materials and design (8.5)
V. Shortcomings in conservation planning and development processes (8.6)
VI. Challenges with consulting and involving people (8.7)
VII. Concerns about legal protection and politics (8.8)
VIII. Concerns about social problems and vandalism (8.9)
IX. Concerns about marketing and commercialisation (8.10)
X. Concerns about education, enjoyment, interpretation and access (8.11)
Table 8.1 in Appendix 6 provides a comparison between the key findings of the case study survey and the key conclusions and recommendations of the previous chapters. This cross-examination of findings and recommendations will be summarised at the end of the chapter and lead to the final conclusions and recommendations.

8.2 Awareness and recognition

The need to raise awareness and to improve recognition of landscapes of the recent past came up as one of the key findings in the literature review and in the analysis of existing registers and the continuing damage that occurs to sites. Again in the case study survey the topic received 11.90 per cent of the responses, which reconfirmed the need for more initiatives to increase awareness. The analysis of responses resulted in a summary of findings under issues relating to people’s opinions of landscapes of the recent past, and the impact of lack of awareness and recognition on the conservation of these sites.

8.2.1 People’s opinions of landscapes of the recent past

The survey responses confirmed that there is still a strong lack of awareness and recognition of landscapes from the recent past and that this does have an effect on opinions. The main conclusions that surfaced could be grouped under three headings:

• Not everyone has an opinion
• Not everyone has a low opinion
• People’s opinions change and evolve

8.2.1.1 Not everyone has an opinion

The survey brought to light that many people do not have an opinion about landscapes of the recent past and have no real interest in them. When the interviewees were asked why they believed that there was a low perception of landscape architecture of the recent past, or what people’s opinion is in general, some highlighted that maybe we first need to wonder if people have an opinion at all about this. What became clear was that not having an opinion appears to relate to the issue of people having no interest in the subject of landscape architecture, or in general not being aware of landscape architecture. A respondent who works near the Bannockburn site, when asked what her opinion about the modernist features was, said ‘…I never thought about that. You
just take it for granted. It is just there…’. Another neighbour at Bannockburn expressed similar thoughts by saying that the site did not really interest them and they never go up there. A respondent who is involved in the friends group at Suntrap Garden, a garden with a strong educational and ecological emphasis and a modern house designed by Sir Robert Matthew, mentioned that she was not familiar with modernism. In the interviews it also became clear that even landscape professionals are often not aware of the full significance of the site, even though they are involved at these sites. A gardener at the Gibberd Garden worried that it was not clear to her what it meant that the garden was a ‘modernist garden’ and what this stylistic description stood for, this while she believed that ‘…gardeners have to understand the garden, and empathise with it, to know what needs to be done…’.

In the survey respondents also indicated a number of reasons why people may not have an opinion about landscapes of the recent past. A respondent who works at Bannockburn, which has a 1960s visitor centre with landscaping of that era, believes that most people are not aware of landscape design per se, due to lack of education and information. Others spoke about the association with architecture and political associations as reasons or believe that there is prejudice against landscape design executed in combination with Twentieth Century architecture in general, and give as one of the possible reasons the association with the post war welfare state and left wing ambitions. Within this context an interviewed landscape architect mentioned the problem of landscape not being appreciated as being relevant:

‘…and it will always take second best. It will always have the lowest budget, and being at the end of the contract it always get cut down to nothing. Therefore people look at it and say; well, landscape is not really relevant, is it? Because it is a self-defeating thing, because people aren’t educated enough, haven’t seen enough in Britain, (who aren’t even landscape architects or architects) to know that it can be done better…’.

When contemplating on what would be possible reasons behind the lack of interest and low opinions, a respondent pointed the finger at the design professionals themselves, and the detachment of the architectural profession. He thought that in the post war years from 1945 to 1970 there was enthusiasm and support for planning and redevelopment but he feels that this ‘….was not rewarded by openness and sympathy from the design professions - who have since blamed lack of public interest and called
for participation...’. Another contributing factor mentioned is how gardens and landscaping are shown in the media. It was mentioned that in the news and media ‘...we have silly garden shows that say; a garden is significant...’, and that wider public landscapes are less portrayed as being significant. A result is, in his opinion, that we do not spend enough money on them.

8.2.1.2 Not everyone has a low opinion

Another important conclusion was that many people have a positive opinion of design from the recent past, and believe that landscape architecture can make a significant contribution, but that at the same time traditional designs are appreciated more easily.

Many people have a positive opinion and find that there was good design from the recent past

In the survey some interviewees said that even though they believe that low opinions exist, that this is not always the case. A respondent who is involved in the Gibberd Garden Trust said that he is not aware of any prejudice against landscape architecture and believes that Sir Frederick Gibberd was a notable landscape architect who is well known and that his work was truly visionary.

One owner of a landscape of the recent past remained a firm supporter of post war design and disagreed with the idea of low general perception saying that ‘...there have been some wonderful schemes post war and on a wide scale and mostly in the public sector whereas pre-war much of the work was on private estates...’. Others remarked that they do not subscribe to low perception or even feel that people hold ‘...much landscaping of the post war period in high esteem, for example the colourful roadside landscaping...’. A respondent even explained how she was actually more fascinated by recent designs then by older works and will more likely visit a Twentieth Century site than older sites. Reasons given for this included that she feels that she understands more what is behind them and can better relate to heritage of the Twentieth Century.

Many respondents agreed that there is plenty of good design from the post-1945 period. A respondent described this by saying that there are even some highly significant landscape design, much of it ‘...inspired by the Festival of Britain and the post World War Two generation of new towns as well as (often on a larger scale) by
Landscape architecture can make a significant contribution

An opinion expressed was that landscape architecture can be tremendously exciting and it can help an otherwise featureless site. A respondent gave the example of Charles Jencks’ Landform at the Gallery of Modern Art in Edinburgh (Fig. 21), which sits in an urban environment and where this new heavily contoured landscape feature now makes a worthwhile contribution. Students at Stirling University (Fig. 47 and Fig. 48) also voiced how landscaping can improve a site. They feel that the landscaping at the campus is particularly appreciated as it plays a role in softening the impact of the poor quality buildings.

Traditional designs are appreciated more easily, while people struggle more with newer design styles

One response that came out of the survey strongly was that one reason for mixed opinions is that when people think about recent landscaping they often associate sites with newer design trends and stylistic movements such as modernism. Many respondents pointed out that in the recent past much of the landscaping was done in very traditional styles and that those sites in general do not attract the low opinions. Traditional designs were described by respondents as more classical, romantic, traditional looking, and referred to as ‘Jekyll and Robinson’ approaches. Styles that went back to the late Nineteenth Century but that remained popular in the Twentieth Century. When speaking about less popular designs people appear to refer to modernist design or more architectural designs with much use of concrete.

A respondent felt that more imagination is needed to understand modern architecture, while traditional designs are easier to understand, and that we are better schooled to value classicism. For example Percy Cane used elements that are very comfortable, romantic and easy to understand. A feeling expressed was that the use of familiar ideas are more easily appreciated as they were less challenging to people’s perceptions. The use of traditional design appears to be more of a guarantee for positive reactions. A factor mentioned was that in the past things were often done much more ‘...with an awful lot more feeling for nature or the look of the eye...’, and ‘...not in your face...’.
Fig. 47: Stirling University’s pleasant and much appreciated landscaping (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 48: Stirling University Campus (Author’s photograph).
What should not be forgotten is that many modernist designers used classical elements. For example at Suntrap, where Robert Matthew designed the modernist house, he also designed the traditional compost heap and dovecote, almost as follies (Fig. 49). Visitors in general speak about the pleasing appearance of these folly features, while the house, which is potentially of higher heritage significance, is rather disliked. Similarly Pitmedden is a garden with parterres that were created in the 1950s, but which now are much appreciated and regarded as significant (Fig. 50).

We can certainly conclude that opinions about recent landscape architecture are not black and white. We cannot generalise and say that people’s opinion about landscape architecture from the recent past are all negative, or all positive. From the survey it was clear that there are many different opinions, and mixed opinions between certain aspects of landscape architecture of the recent past.

**People struggle to recognise that what is relatively new can be of heritage significance**

Closely linked to this, it could be noted how respondents felt that if something is relatively new, lots of people do struggle to attach any historic significance to it. This was clear from respondents saying that everything pre-war was more or less timeless. Some believed that this perception existed because in the mind of many the tendency was to equate pre-war with quality and post war with inferior quality. Respondents expressed this by referring to a romanticising of the distant history, or by calling it the nostalgia for the distant past. A respondent said that people find ‘...the idea of placing value on socially significant places more difficult (instead of on sites just being old)...’ and that the public in general likes things to be either extremely old, or entirely new if sufficiently hyped in the media, meaning that when sites are no longer sufficiently new, they are easily condemned.

**8.2.1.3 Opinions of people and the general public also change and evolve**

The responses from the surveys taught us that it should not be forgotten that people’s opinions change over time, that the acceptance of new styles takes time and that this relates to the fact that fashions evolve.
Fig. 49: Suntrap’s mixture of styles, with the modernist house and traditional garden buildings that were designed by Sir Robert Matthew (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 50: Pitmedden’s formal parterres in a traditional style, created by the National Trust for Scotland in the 1950s (Author’s photograph).
Opinions change
Respondents spoke about how they see that opinions evolve. While people at times are unaware of landscape architecture, or have a lack of interest in landscapes, this can alter over time, or even through visiting sites. For example at Suntrap Garden a respondent described how seeing the garden can influence people’s opinion and that he had seen people that came with a low opinion of the gardens or architecture of this era and left with a different opinion. At Little Sparta Trust people involved have also seen the interest of the public in the garden evolve: ‘...in the past people have been curious about this garden. Next people were curious because the garden had been in the news...Recently people really just want to go see the garden...’. Ian Hamilton Finlay and Little Sparta is a fascinating example of how public opinions can shift over the years. Something that of course is not uncommon in the artistic world. In the case of Ian Hamilton Finlay people from other countries played an important role in the gradual shift in respect for his work. People from the United States, Italy, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands first had fantastic responses to his work and paved the way, before the Scottish establishment also decided to embrace him ‘...as the great old man of Scottish arts...’.

Acceptance of new styles takes time
Respondents spoke about how the public needs time to accept and comprehend change and that both people and a nation need time and distance to comprehend and appreciate change. Opinions voiced were: that there is often a time lag in the acceptance of the avant-garde in all the arts, and that distance of time lends more balance to opinions. A respondent mentioned in this context how the two World Wars had wrought vast social changes and caused our society to need a long time to move on again and be receptive to change again.

A factor given is that design and the use of new materials has moved on so fast that people have had difficulty in keeping up. In Scotland a respondent thought that maybe by nature the Scots are slow to accept change, but others think that the fact that we now have entered a new millennium helps with the acceptance of change. An example that was given on how opinions often change, is how ecological awareness has evolved since the 1990s. This has resulted in a degree of neglect being accepted under the motto of ecologically sound gardening, or the ideology of wild gardening.
The importance of changing fashions

A reason given by respondents as contributory to low opinions is that fashions change. What is fashionable today will be out of fashion tomorrow and lots of trends from the recent past are out of fashion now. It always takes time for fashion to be reassessed and reappreciated, if it ever is to do so. This was referred to as a generational thing and that a rejection of the past often takes about twenty years. A respondent believed that after a period of rejection we often see a renaissance of fashion and that we are now reappreciating the fashions of the 1960s, adding that for a period things may look jaded but fashions do come back. For example at Cumbernauld a respondent said that some of the housing used to be considered as fantastic about fifty years ago and even received an award, while they now find it less pleasing. Neighbours interviewed in Cumbernauld expressed that they felt that there was nothing wrong with the angular structures and that they believed they were now coming back into fashion.

Respondents were at times of the opinion that the speed at which fashion changed had increased in the recent past, while pre-1945 everything was more or less timeless. As a result everything dated very quickly and because landscape architecture had developed much in the recent past, a result was that fashion changes had a major impact on opinions about landscape architecture.

8.2.2 Impacts of lack of awareness and recognition

In the survey several respondents mentioned impacts that the lack of awareness and recognition has on the conservation and protection of sites.

Lack of recognition impacts the legal protection of sites

Several respondents mentioned that one of their concerns with poor recognition is that there is no proper legal protection for these sites. One opinion voiced was that a combination of listing of key elements of a site together with a designation as a conservation area could enable better protection. There was a feeling however that the managers of sites might try to avoid listing because of the consequences of listing. Respondents mentioned nevertheless that they felt that to make listing and protection efficient there was a need for popular support so that the ‘watchdogs’ were vigilant. Due to poor recognition of the significance of recent past landscapes some respondents were not very optimistic about this.
Effects of lack of awareness on funding for sites
Some respondents believed that a consequence of poor recognition is that it affects the availability of funds for such sites.

Lack of awareness contributes to a lack of understanding of the significance of sites
A conclusion is that lack of recognition of the significance of a site often is a consequence of poor understanding of a site, but it also means that frequently those responsible decide not to further their understanding of the site. Feelings were expressed at Suntrap Garden (Fig. 51) that the site had suffered from this for many years. There was a feeling that no one had taken an interest in gaining understanding about the site as no one saw much significance in a garden of such recent origin. People involved at the site were glad that in recent years awareness had increased about the site and that a recent study had helped to establish the values of the site. A respondent pointed out that the owners or managing organisations must establish the true value of sites, as it is paramount for any conservation decisions.

Lack of recognition results in lack of respect for sites
Respondents mentioned that a sad result of poor awareness of the significance of sites from the recent past meant that people less respected sites from this era. This apparently often translated as a lack of respect from the neighbouring community and meant that those responsible for the management and maintenance of sites did not always take care of sites. Respondents expressed that they felt that a lack of respect for sites could result in poor conservation of sites.

8.3 Concerns about management and maintenance of sites
Chapter Five on the continuing destruction and disfigurement of significant sites illustrated that serious concerns in relation to the management and maintenance of sites exist. While, as reviewed in Chapter Five, several existing recommendations on heritage of the recent past have highlighted these concerns, Table 2.1 in Appendix 1 illustrates how a number of recommendations include demands for action on this subject.
The case study survey provides an opportunity to explore key concerns in relation to the management and maintenance of sites. Of all the items raised by respondents, 4.21 per cent of the issues mentioned fall under concerns about the poor management and maintenance of sites. The responses and issues are grouped under maintenance concerns and management concerns.

**8.3.1 Maintenance concerns**

**8.3.1.1 Low opinions caused by poor maintenance of sites**

The survey confirmed that the maintenance of sites clearly has a strong influence on forming people’s opinions about designed landscapes of the recent past. One respondent remarked that more often than not the perception is related to poor maintenance, such as the visible process of decline. Others described how the state of buildings on a site has an effect on perception. Simple design, such as landscaping with few undulations and plant beds at Cumbernauld, was used to facilitate easier maintenance of sites, but this also has its impact on people’s perception of sites. Even
if a design is good, a respondent thought that the ‘loving aftercare’ is essential. Another opinion was that design and layout should not be separated from development and upkeep because gardens and landscapes are processes and not merely objects.

8.3.1.2 Threats to sites due to poor maintenance

Neglect of sites through poor maintenance
Respondents saw general maintenance as a key issue. At Bannockburn an interviewed neighbour felt that the site did not look tidy enough, rather dilapidated ‘…knowing how significant the site is…’, and other respondents said that especially hidden areas are poorly maintained. ‘The problem of Bannockburn’ was described as being ‘…all about maintenance…’. Respondents at the site said that staff frequently received complaints about this. The appearance of some modern buildings, described as looking ‘…grubby because it is a grey dull colour…’ also did not seem to contribute to the maintenance appearance.

Poor maintenance repairs
Respondents frequently spoke about concerns relating to poor repairs and modifications on sites. An interviewee was not impressed by some changes on the Stirling Campus where ‘…some of the paths are very dark. They have been putting in lights but they have been digging up the roads and put it just down, and that made it look horrible…’. In Cumbernauld a respondent referred to an example of the effect of the annual cross country event and that ‘…at the end of it the field is turned up, muddy, and nothing is done to it. When repaired, there is not enough time for it to grow. So now it is a swamp…’. Repairs by the Council received criticism from local residents that were interviewed in Cumbernauld. One described how ‘…the Council put a new fence around a newly planted and grassed corner, but it is of poor material, and poorly erected, basically an eyesore. It is a health and safety hazard with the spikes, and just a quick fix…’. Another respondent felt that ‘…the only thing they do is cut grass. They seem frantic about cutting grass…’. Other comments were raised about maintenance work, such as ‘…when they come to trim shrubs, they do not even clean up…’ or ‘…they did some new planting and put bark on the soil, but this went down the drain, so now they are again blocked…’.
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Lack of maintenance leading to loss of features
Respondents said that they saw as a major concern the fact that poor maintenance led too often to loss of sites. Speaking about Bannockburn and the modernist landscaping concept and architectural features, an interviewee felt that ‘…those responsible have allowed it to deteriorate to a degree that a lot of its meaning is lost and now interpretation is needed so that people would understand the meaning and value of the features. The features are not given a chance now to be seen as valuable. If you present a building like that, for example you remove lots of features such as furniture and ornaments, and offer no interpretation, how can people then enjoy it...’. Also at Falkland Palace there was a feeling that features were lost due to reduced maintenance levels or capacity, for example ‘…the orchard has been a little bit neglected in terms of conservation…the old routes that went through the orchard were lost…’. A respondent believed that the restoration of the routes would reinstate lost connections at the garden and ‘…meet modern day development in terms of being able to have accessible footpaths for the users…’.

Threat of demolition and sales of sites
The potential demolition or destruction of sites came up several times in the survey. Speaking about Suntrap Garden, a response was that it is seen as a very attractive site that could be sold for a lot of money for new building development, with devastating impacts. Similar concerns were raised about Cumbernauld where it was thought that ‘…the biggest danger that the Seafar neighbourhood (Fig. 53) faces is that it will be demolished and the landscape removed with it…’. Within this context it was highlighted that conservation must be facilitated by keeping the place open. Interviewed visitors at Little Sparta had their concerns about the site and saw the danger that many art objects in the garden could be sold off. After a visit one respondent summed up by saying that ‘…as the art is an integral part of the garden design concept I believe that Little Sparta without its art objects would be of much lower conservation value, if of any…’.

8.3.1.3 Continuity and commitment

Continuity in maintenance
The importance of consistency and continuity of maintenance was mentioned by some respondents. At the Gibberd Garden an interviewee described that a maintenance
backlog had built up in the 1980s and that this made current conservation more complicated. A respondent explained how the Gibberd Garden from 1984 until 1995 was poorly maintained and lost its shape and form. By the time the Gibberd Garden Trust was established in 1995, the planting had to be cut back drastically and it was not always clear what the differences were between the intended planting and weeds or seedlings. If the Gibberd Garden Trust had started in 1984, there would have been better continuity in maintenance.

Fig. 52: Dunbar’s Close Garden, Edinburgh (Author’s photograph).

The challenge for Little Sparta, was described in a response as to achieve ‘…the sort of continuity which will be important in maintaining the character of the garden…’, and this was seen as having the same designated gardener at a site, as well as decent transition from one gardener to the next. At Dunbar’s Close Garden in Edinburgh (Fig. 52) a respondent explained that progress with continuity in maintenance was achieved by agreeing with the City of Edinburgh Council that there would be a designated Council’s gardener. At one garden the son of the current gardener is being trained up, potentially allowing interesting continuity. Here an overlap between gardeners of at least a year between the outgoing gardener and the new one was seen as most
important to assist with continuity of maintenance. At Falkland Palace Garden a gardener had been there for about forty years before retiring and his father had worked there also as the Head Gardener for several decades, this as far back as when the garden was designed by Percy Cane. Such continuity is now becoming rare and with it often much knowledge is being lost because there is no smooth transition between gardeners.

**Commitment to the garden**
Not only continuity in maintenance, but also the right kind of commitment is essential. An interviewed gardener at a site mentioned how ‘...it has always been a free reign as far as looking after the gardens was concerned, and maintaining them, and also some of the developments, and design...’. The owner treated the gardener as if it was his garden and would say to the gardener ‘...may I do this in your garden...you are looking after it, I ask your opinion. Is that all right if I do this?...’. The owner was of the opinion that the gardener is either in charge of that or not. The gardener said he saw it as the owner’s garden, but meanwhile said that he would protect the interest of the owner and himself in the garden. At the same time the gardener that was interviewed described that dedication and passion for the garden is not so much about ownership, but ‘...it is the fact that you are living with those plants. It’s like a family almost, you are nurturing them...’. Through such examples the survey confirmed how commitment to a garden by the gardeners is essential to assure the needed maintenance and conservation.

**8.3.1.4 Lower expectations of maintenance in public spaces**
Especially in private gardens high maintenance was seen as being essential, but respondents raised as a concern that lower maintenance standards appeared to be generally accepted in public spaces, both by the public and more worrisome, by those that were responsible for the maintenance. This was for example clear from a response about the Bannockburn landscaping, saying ‘...we are not going to want to make it into a beautiful garden. I think for a park it is good....’. Similarly, a respondent felt that ‘...because it is a park we also expect lower standards...for a public park area I do not think you expect it to be beautifully manicured at all the time. You expect it to look used as that is what it is there for....’.

Interviewees in Cumbernauld voiced unhappiness about the poor state of public landscaping and complained about how Council authorities allowed landscaping to
deteriorate (Fig. 53). Respondents in Cumbernauld described how the Cumbernauld Development Corporation (CDC) ‘…used to be on the ball…’, but said that the new North Lanarkshire Council (NLC) ‘…finds excuses for everything…’. Another person interviewed thought that ‘…now it is a disgrace, poor maintenance, the shrubs and so on. We must phone the Council up when we need something while the Cumbernauld Development Corporation used to look after everything. We wonder where our money is going to…’. In Cumbernauld respondents raised that they thought that the change of responsibility from a local Development Corporation to a new Council, with their head offices in another town contributed to the deterioration in maintenance, something which in principle should not be the case if a proper and effective administration system is in place.

Fig. 53: The Seafar neighbourhood in Cumbernauld New Town (Author’s photograph).

8.3.1.5 Staffing levels and equipment for maintenance

**Shortage of maintenance staff**

This is a concern that in general always comes up when speaking about gardens and in this survey a typical expression relating to staffing levels was that they could ‘…do
with a bit more help…’. Respondents felt that at times the problem was particularly bad due to many sites being developed with high maintenance in mind. Many respondents now saw low staffing levels as serious threats to sites. They could understand that increased mechanisation might mean a lower head count, but were afraid that much detailed work no longer took place. Gardeners themselves spoke about issues of weekend work, short-term contracts, and the need to rely more and more on volunteers to keep on top of the work. An interviewed gardener felt that it was becoming ‘…difficult to cope with maintenance, renovation and progress…’.

**Staff lacking the right maintenance skills and the need for skills and training**

Another important concern raised by respondents was that poor maintenance often was a result of staff not having the correct skills. A respondent mentioned that the formal pond garden in Falkland Garden (Fig. 54) should be the ‘…jewel in the crown…’ of the Percy Cane garden, but felt that ‘…the pond requires the best attention which it is not getting at present…’ and saw this as a problem with the gardeners, but as well with the advisers…’. Several respondents highlighted that head gardeners also need to know more and more and that there were ‘…few people coming through to be trained properly…’ and that there was ‘…a general lack of interest in these little pockets of social history…’. Respondents raised their concerns about the lack of skills and an understanding of designs of the recent past amongst gardeners. At the Gibberd Garden a comment made was that a professional gardener in the past ‘…cut everything and did no end of damage…’. At Little Sparta the feeling also was that the ‘…faith of the garden depends on the skills of the gardener…’ and there is a concern that the right gardener may not be found once the current gardener retires. Reasons given for this included that the garden was the product of the working relationship between the owner and the gardener. Similarly a respondent spoke at one site about possible future challenges to replace artwork. The owner used to put his ideas onto paper and then ask a craftsman to execute this onto the stonework. If the art pieces were not executed as wished by the owner, or not good enough, the owner would reject them, until they were as wished. When the time comes to replace some works the difficulty will be how to implement similar strict quality control and to find the same craftsmanship skills.

Another issue was raised at Suntrap where for budget reasons the gardener has to do part-time garden maintenance and part-time buildings maintenance. These are two
different skills and finding the right individual with highest expertise in both skills is not realistic. Other respondents spoke about the importance of incorporating training opportunities in the conservation work at sites, with specifically a focus on landscapes of the recent past. For example at Suntrap, gardener’s courses were run as part of Oatridge College’s program and there was a feeling that placement and secondment opportunities should exist there. A respondent thought that a garden like Little Sparta should provide access for professionals, students, writers and scholars for training and research purposes.

![The Pond Garden at Falkland Palace](image)

**Fig. 54**: The Pond Garden at Falkland Palace (Author’s photograph).

**The need for maintenance equipment and material**

One of the major concerns raised under the availability of means was the shortage of funding for equipment, material, and plants, which are essential for proper maintenance and repairs. For example, a respondent said they needed more tools, that machinery was getting old, and that a computer is necessary in this day of age. At Little Sparta the opinions were that most money goes to the gardener’s wages, equipment, plants, and material, which was apparently largely seen as what the Little Sparta Trust
manages to achieve. Closely related to materials are also facilities and accommodation, which were occasionally mentioned by site staff.

8.3.1.6 Impacts of design and understanding on maintenance

**Impractical designs causing maintenance issues**

The fact that many sites had impractical designs from maintenance perspective was also mentioned. For example, a respondent spoke about his concern with the pebble-bottomed pool at the front of the building at Scottish Widows, Edinburgh (Fig. 55), which in his opinion had not received the maintenance it requires, but thought that it is perhaps simply impractical.

![Fig. 55: The pebble-bottomed pool at Scottish Widows, Edinburgh, designed by Sylvia Crowe (Author’s photograph).](image)

**Misinformed maintenance due to an insufficient understanding of the original concept and intentions**

Some respondents raised their concerns about not understanding the original concept for the landscaping at the site where they were involved. One respondent said that
'...at the moment I do not know that we preserve or conserve it. We cut the grass, trim it, but we do not look at whatever was the concept. I do not think that anybody really knows what was attempted here...'. Similar concerns about the initial intentions were raised at Little Sparta where the maintenance of garden sculpture is essential and integral to the site. A respondent thought that Ian Hamilton Finlay used to take several of the sculptures inside in the Winter as ‘...for some works to be out there ten to fifteen years is pretty remorseless...’, and wondered if alternatively we should replace sculptures when they have completely weathered. Respondents described that in order to take the right maintenance decision, it helps that design intent has been recorded. A respondent was especially worried about intended planting schemes at Little Sparta when saying that ‘...the trees, shrubs and flowers have to be maintained in the shape and quantity that their contribution to the artwork requires...’, while another respondent wondered whether we know precisely what Ian Hamilton Finlay’s thoughts were on the future of the garden, and ‘...how he envisaged managing the growth and death of trees shrubs? Or did he think nature should be allowed to do its own thing and eventually submerge the sculptures? Any conservation management plan would need to take such issues on board...’. At the Gibberd Garden similar questions were voiced when a respondent said that they now ‘...take the nettles out, but are not clear about other weeds, or wild flowers...’, this because they knew that the site was not intended as a perfectly manicured garden, but they were not sure what the intention of maintenance and presentation should be.

**8.3.1.7 High cost of maintenance**

Strong opinions were raised about the cost of maintenance. The issues relating to high costs of maintenance were described at Suntrap Garden as ‘...a can of worms...’ and wondered ‘...who wants to pay for that?...’. A respondent felt that it all comes down to money at Suntrap, but saw bigger issues for the buildings, and thought that the garden was less of a concern as it was managed by a land based college.

**8.3.1.8 Taking into account environmental friendly approaches and climate change**

A respondent spoke about the importance of organic and ecological approaches at designed landscapes, and gave the example of Suntrap where they work without chemicals in the vegetable garden, teach about recycling and work as organic as
possible. Participating respondents worried about the impacts of climate change and explained how at Little Sparta the management of water has become a major issue. At times there is insufficient water and at other moments too much. A respondent sees clear evidence that it is changing and this threatens certain features, such as the ponds.

8.3.2 Management concerns

The collapse of management and the absence of the right management structure

At Cumbernauld a respondent raised his concern that there appears to be an absence of an effective management structure and that there seems to be a situation where no one takes responsibility. The respondent explained how there used to be a very strong administrative government at Cumbernauld when it was constructed, ‘...almost a colonial development organisation, with a strong authority...that developed an utopian concept...’. This governmental structure collapsed in later years and everything went from a very strong driving force to what was referred to as ‘...almost nothing...’. The concerns in Cumbernauld about the current situation with an apparent failure by the North Lanarkshire Council to deliver the expected maintenance standards were already indicated. Without a proper administrative and management structure in place sites such as Cumbernauld are thought to be in danger. A respondent reflected on this issue and is of the opinion that where an ‘...organisation does not have it in its gift to fully manage and maintain or develop the site, it should give up its control and offer it to a body that can properly care for it...’.

The situation appeared though not as grim everywhere, and optimistic responses were received about the formation of the Little Sparta Trust to take over the management of Little Sparta from the previous owner. A respondent believed that the engagement of people who knew the owner directly was the best hope for the garden and expects that what the new trust will hopefully reflect the spirit of the owner’s ‘...own travels through this landscape...’. The Little Sparta Trust spent years talking to the previous owner and as a result has clear ideas what the owner would like to happen. The Trust sees itself as facilitating the discussions to progress the conservation of the site. The trust is also there to enable the vision that the owner constructed to be sustained and enjoyed by visitors and other people. Interviewed members of the Little Sparta Trust said that the
Trust sees itself as being entrusted with the site: ‘...It is up to us to fulfil that trust...We are very conscious that the garden belongs to more than just us. It belongs to the nation and the wider cultural world. Everything we do must be responsive to that. We have to protect it, that is true, but we also have to ensure that it remains true to the ideas of its creator...’. Those respondents realized though that at present it is still very idealistic and that this may change when they might in the future struggle to raise all the required funds.

**Need for stewardship at properties rather than centralised management and committee decision making**

Respondents mentioned that ideally they feel that decisions about sites should be taken at the sites. In the case of Cumbernauld the problems with the management structure may be caused by a centralised management structure, based in another town. Similarly at Falkland Garden staff interviewed complained about colleagues at the central office being ‘faceless’. They said that ‘...we know there are people at the top, in offices, but we do not actually see them. Also with e-mails, we do not know if they receive them...’. On the other hand decisions are often taken in a centralised manner, away from the site, or as a respondent said: ‘...We are not bothered to be asked. All happens higher up...’, and no one from other levels, right down the chain, is involved. The gardeners and site staff felt that they ‘...have to work here and implement, and if we are not happy with the garden and decisions then things will not work. Staff here do not look after things if they do not support the ideas and decisions...’. They feel that decisions should, therefore, be taken at properties, but it would be nice if they could have a closer relationships with the offices, for encouragements, and support. One respondent said that ‘...we do not expect answers, but encouragements...’.

Similar concerns where raised about ‘committee decision making’ at Falkland Palace. A respondent wondered about this by asking ‘...Who holds the place?...’, and believes that this should be one person. This often is the Head Gardener, but in the case of a National Trust for Scotland the respondent said that it is not the garden of the Head Gardener but of the Trust. Therefore he asked the question: ‘...Who really cares for this place, and who is really holding this? Who holds this in their heads, hearts?...’. At one site family members interviewed still wished that someone from the family can be the keeper of the place. They believe that one person should take up the role of
steward and think ‘...I am the person holding this place and now for this generation, and I need to account to people, but actually I am that steward...’. They believe that with lots of people on committees it is not always the easiest way to move on. This is partly due to the fact that committees change. With a committee you have a democratic steward said a respondent, but he doubts that you can actually run a garden by a committee. He believes that a garden should be held in one person’s hand and that person in turn has to account to other people: ‘...we all need to be clear to that one person, and that person must be helped to hold authority, and encouraged, and challenged...’. On the other hand, some respondents, who were on-site staff did not feel comfortable about taking all decisions and being responsible, as they did not feel that they understood the site well enough to do so, and they accepted that decisions were taken by committees and boards.

**The challenges of working with previous owners**

While the wish to involve previous owners was mentioned by some respondents, others also were of the opinion that involving and consulting previous owners will at times cause conflict. A respondent described how he believes that trustees will speak about the ‘vested interest’ of former owners, while the owners mostly find that they should be kept involved from the beginning, and not just through being allowed to attend a committee. An interviewee raised the example of how at their garden the former owner would not agree with everything that was done for conservation purposes and was understandably very conservative about the garden. The respondent had, however, noticed how, slowly, the previous owner started to understand that the restoration and renewal of a garden required difficult decisions. Even though such processes are not always that easy, keeping the former owners involved remains essential. At another site the owner’s family that were interviewed said that there had not always been sufficient transparency and open discussion between the gardeners and the family, but this has much improved in recent years which they believed ‘...has to be the way forward...’.

**The impact of poor management on opinions**

The survey confirmed that the management of sites influences people’s opinions about designed landscapes of the recent past. The way that management is planned at site level was given as a reason for poor opinions. One example given was that sites are often not used as intended. The case of Bannockburn was highlighted as a heritage
site, which is given its urban location now used by many young people as a public park, rather than a memorial site. The result is that there is much vandalism and use of drugs on the site. The fact that maintenance at the site is low adds to the issues and the opinions people have about the place. A worry by a respondent was that if the site now gets renovated, it possibly would just as quickly get vandalised again.

8.4 Concerns about finance and budgets

When asked about the availability of means for the conservation of sites, it was no surprise that respondents mostly said that their first concern was money. In total 9.05 per cent of all items raised in the responses related to finances and budgets. Proper funding underpins all conservation activities and the subject was also highlighted in several recommendations that were studied in the literature review. It is therefore no surprise that concerns relating to funding came up in the case study survey.

8.4.1 Insufficient funds

Shortage of money for skilled staff
A key concern mentioned was that there were not sufficient budgets in place for enough staff to maintain a site and to attract the right skills. A respondent felt that the knowledge that a good head gardener now requires to undertake his task is phenomenal, but that now ‘...poor salaries are attracting poor candidates with little training and even less interest...’ Insufficient staff frustrated gardeners that were interviewed at the Gibberd Garden as ‘...they do not want to do things over and over again...’.

General lack of money
Respondents voiced concerns such as that there is ‘...never sufficient money...’, that ‘...it all comes down to money...’ and that the maintenance of designed landscapes ‘...is today an expensive luxury...’. At Suntrap Garden respondents said that ‘...anybody with money is welcome...’, but after reflection added ‘...anybody except a developer, that would break my heart...’. While the Gibberd Garden Trust seemed happy with their budget staff interviewed still felt that ‘...they needed to get funding to employ someone to run the shop and the catering facilities...’ and if they would have more funds, they could improve more areas...’ At Falkland Palace a concern was
rather the funding for some larger projects, a concern which was echoed at the Gibberd Garden as they did not know if there was funding to carry out new projects. At Bannockburn a respondent said that due to the struggle for financial viability they must look at everything closely to see if it is worth spending, even cutting the grass.

At some sites respondents felt confident that ‘...funding is no problem...’. For example at the Gibberd Garden a respondent was glad that they so far had managed to receive sufficient funding awards. The Gibberd Garden succeeded in a bid for support from the Heritage Lottery Fund to prepare a conservation plan and a bid for restoration. The Heritage Lottery Fund later awarded £550,000 funding to buy the garden, sculptures and to pay for restoration. A respondent who was interviewed about Portrack (Fig. 56) also saw no funding issue there yet, as it is a private and privately funded garden.

Respondents highlighted that many sites of the recent past were constructed in a period of lack of resources, meaning a combination of limited financial resources and limited availability of quality material resources. A respondent pointed out how he presumed that much of the urban landscaping was executed on a limited budget. Other respondents had different opinions and thought that resources had not always been a problem in the recent past. At Suntrap Garden a respondent said that in the 1960s and 1970s plenty of finances appeared to be available for construction and maintenance, and saw the problem arising in the Thatcher era of the 1980s when there were stricter controls on budgets, with amounts of money spend on green space drastically cut back, resulting in neglect.

Most sites also have important buildings and many respondents saw the shortage of funds being spent on buildings as a problem area. For example, respondents at Stirling University argued that more money had to be spent on buildings at the campus to enhance the site but thought it would cost millions to resolve this.
Concerns that money may run out
Worries were voiced about what would happen to Dunbar’s Close Garden when the Mushroom Trust stopped their funding support. At Suntrap Garden similar concerns existed about what would happen if Oatridge College withdrew its support. A respondent was particularly concerned as the income at the site is below the expenditure. A comment given was that possibly the National Trust for Scotland could again step in, as it partially owns Suntrap. At Little Sparta respondents saw challenges to generate sufficient funds for the maintenance of the garden as it exists today, but also for the eventual replacement of particular elements or the introduction of new features.

8.4.2 Dissatisfaction over wasted funds
Respondents often voiced their dissatisfaction about how funds were spent. At Cumbernauld several respondents made comments like ‘…when we report something, such as a burst pipe, it takes days to get repaired…the companies run with the profits…’ and ‘…no one looks after it, and nothing gets done…’. A response was that ‘…the Council says they don’t have money to do everything, but we have the highest
Council tax...we never see them working here...’. Others felt that ‘...money was spent on the other side of the Council area...’ and were not sure that the money was spent well and thought that there should be a greater distribution of funds.

Concerns were voiced about funding driven development. At the Gibberd Garden respondents mentioned the example of the new arboretum, which had been created with donations. The feeling was that ‘...this is the sort of thing that Gibberd would have done...’, but nevertheless others had their concerns over what appears like a funding driven development. While this appears to be a positive new development for the Gibberd Garden, people were concerned whether the resources to maintain such development were in place. In contrast, respondents indicated also that funding offers are not always taken up. Again at the Gibberd Garden there had been an offer to pay for work to be done in the stream area, but the funding was not accepted and the work did not occur.

European regulations were also seen as potentially adding to costs and leading to inappropriate work being done. When a project’s budget is over a certain amount, within these regulations, there is now a requirement to advertise the project Europe-wide. A concern expressed was that ‘...we end up with the most inappropriate people working on the most inappropriate jobs...’ and that is when you have the famous but inappropriate design companies coming in.

8.4.3 Concerns over funding partnerships

At Dunbar’s Close Garden a respondent highlighted that it was because of a funding commitment by the Mushroom Trust that a gardener and landscape consultant could be paid. There was a concern that ‘...if their involvement and financing support would ever disappear, then the site would be endangered...’. The Mushroom Trust’s funding allowed for the garden, which is a council garden, to be maintained to high standards. A respondent saw this in itself as dangerous. If in the future funding from the Mushroom Trust would cease, the maintenance level might drop significantly, with the council committing less resources to the site without external funding.

A respondent recognised that at Dunbar’s Close Garden the City of Edinburgh Council luckily acknowledges the importance of the partnership with the Mushroom Trust and
hopes that the partnership can continue. At Bannockburn the importance of partnerships for funding was also voiced. According to another respondent, the feeling was that ‘...if there is a future we have to start talking to people that have money, not our existing partners, and that may sound drastic, but it is reality...’. Suntrap Garden is also co-owned by the National Trust for Scotland and Oatridge Agricultural College. The College leads the management of the site and has done so through European funding partnerships and West Lothian Council funding partnerships. A respondent believes though that partnerships are a gamble and that they are short term. He said that ‘...you must not put your eggs in one basket...’ and was of the opinion that about five partners are needed, because with only two partners, if one drops out, fifty per cent of the funding may suddenly be lost.

8.4.4 Fundraising challenges

The need to establish endowment funds
Where long-term funding concerns remained, such as at Little Sparta people saw possible salvation in the establishment of an endowment fund for the site. A respondent spoke about ‘...one of the big problems for having the confidence to sustain a garden like that is needing to have...an endowment fund of a couple of millions, so that with the interest you can maintain it. For the moment it is raising money, people have been generous, but it is hand to mouth...’. At the Gibberd Garden respondents also thought that an endowment fund was required and that the garden could ‘...never pay its way by openings alone. The present arrangement is incredibly effective thanks to the valiant efforts of a team of volunteers and friends, but it cannot be relied upon to sustain the garden indefinitely...’. At the Gibberd Garden a concern was mentioned in relation to the difficulty of fundraising for less well-known sites. It is already difficult to fundraise for endowment funds for the better-known sites such as the Gibberd Garden or Little Sparta. Therefore, ‘...if these cannot be sustained, than what with the lesser known sites?...’.

Major public funding for sites with limited access
A respondent raised a concern in relation to Little Sparta because to receive major public funding sites now have to provide proper access. The respondent explained that the difficulty to tap into public funding for a site like Little Sparta, ‘...whose nature
demands quietness and lack of crowds…’, was difficult. She said that ‘…to allow
unlimited access to Little Sparta would destroy it…’ and believes that ‘…the site is so
fragile that we have got to reduce access, rather than expand it, or think about access
in other ways…’. Another respondent thought, however, that meeting access
requirements in return for arts grants and awards would have to be balanced with
achieving financial sustainability. Out of this came a feeling that people wished for a
change of attitude by funding bodies. Some respondents thought that Little Sparta
deserved to be conserved in its current state ‘…as a landmark with regard to art,
landscape and local history…’ and that ‘…this could be funded by the public through a
museum concept or involvement…’. Within this context a respondent was sceptical
about major funding and the associated criteria and requirements, as in the case of
funding by the Heritage Lottery Fund. He referred to the amounts of money that the
Heritage Lottery Fund at times commits to a significant painting, or art museums on the
acquisition or conservation of particular works. Little Sparta is seen as Ian Hamilton
Finlay’s masterpiece, but nevertheless it struggles to receive appropriate funding. At
Little Sparta a respondent believed that ultimately the conservation of the site would
‘…demand the development of exclusive private sector funding…’ or for heritage
bodies to engage in the debate over access to sites.

8.4.5 The influence of finance and budgets on opinions

From the survey responses it can be concluded that public opinions are also influenced
by the lack of financial resources for landscapes of the recent past. Examples given
related to the cost of materials and staffing or consultants fees. Respondents argued
that at present we cannot build to the same quality as in the past because materials
used to be cheaper while now everything has in general become too expensive. A
respondent said that for such reasons people must accept certain standards. For
example, about the concrete rotunda at Bannockburn she said that ‘…it would be nice
to see a rotunda in marble, but that would be too costly…’ and ‘…for this reason they
are allright, but not beautiful…’.

Another respondent raised the impact of low professional fees for landscape
consultants. This respondent said that there are too many poor projects in landscape
design because the fees that landscape architects receive are on average frustratingly
low. He explained how landscape architects often work for half the fees that it should
be, but clients use excuses such as that ‘...it should be a privilege...’ to work on the project. He said landscape architects have to argue that this is what they do for a living and that it is not just a privilege. In comparison he said, some other disciplines often receive fees that are too high.

He explained how on a project an artist’s fee for a sculpture in the landscape was nineteen thousand pounds, saying ‘...that was not the thing she was going to build, that was her actual fee, and she did nothing for that...’. The landscape architect was in this case asked to do all the detailed work for the artist but was paid lower, and so refused to do the work. The respondent believes that landscape architects need to spend time be able to think, but that budgets do not allow this. The result is that we do not get enough good landscape architecture and the ‘...space is just an echo of what it could have been...’. The survey picked up a feeling that there is an unwillingness to spend money on landscape and that ‘... it will always take second place. It will always have the lowest budget, and being at the end of the contract it always gets cut down to nothing...’.

8.5 Challenges associated with materials and design

In total 13.26 per cent of the items raised in the responses of the case study survey related to issues and challenges associated with the materials and designs of landscapes of the recent past. Various recommendations were discussed in the literature review that raised issues about the technological challenges and complexities of the construction materials used in the recent past. The literature review showed that various types of research were already developed on building materials, but less documentation appears available on the subject of the designs and layouts, and the plant material used. The survey allowed the findings of the literature review to be validated and cross-examined and in doing so managed to identify a number of gaps in actions and recommendations in relation to materials and design.
8.5.1 Challenges associated with impractical and experimental design

Impractical designs, not suited to the users
Based on the responses it appears that many conservation problems are caused by issues that relate to the original design of sites. A respondent at Bannockburn said that a poor design caused issues about user-friendliness such as confusing car parks and steps leading nowhere. A student interviewed described the campus of the University of Stirling as difficult to navigate, while a respondent found Cumbernauld too fragmented. One interviewee commented on Percy Cane’s design at Falkland Palace as being ‘…evidently English and not Scottish, and there are elements within it that are exceptionally difficult to maintain in exactly the same way…’. Several respondents found that designs were not inviting for children’s activities.

Academic and experimental designs and planting schemes
A respondent commented on Cumbernauld and thought that possibly the reason for all the problems was that it is ‘…a failure of the whole concept. It was self-contradictory. Based on the idea of something highly integrated…but which had in the centre of the development a sharp, absolutely jarring polarisation…With the notion of open-ended design it was almost tailor-made to collapse into chaos…’. Others spoke about overly ambitious designs, such as at Bannockburn. Respondents recalled that the Seafar neighbourhood (Fig. 53) in Cumbernauld was awarded the Saltire Society Award in 1963 and that the Queen came to visit it. Now they feel that the award never should have been given to the area.

Another respondent agrees when it comes to landscapes by the Modern Movement that the ideas were often utopian. He felt that public landscaping especially was apt to be ideologically, and even politically influenced, and some of the regional Garden Festivals and the 1960-70s new town landscapes left an inadequate legacy. The example given by a respondent about the association of some designs with political movements, illustrates the prejudice that now exists against landscape design, executed in combination with architecture of the recent past, as representing the ideology of the post war welfare state and left wing ambitions. Some of these designs bear no relationship to the place, and the public find it hard to come to terms with the philosophy that is behind some concepts.
Respondents mentioned that they now also face dilemmas due to experimental planting. At Little Sparta and the Gibberd Garden planting appeared to have been too dense, and because the creators at these gardens at times did not see the full effect themselves, it is not always clear what their design intent was. At the Gibberd Garden respondents face, for example, a dilemma about the apple trees in one area that now block the views. Sir Frederick Gibberd experimented with plants and would try out different trees to see what worked best. A respondent thought that Giant Hogweed was planted in the garden by Gibberd as an architectural plant but that it now was a controversial plant to retain in the garden. At Bannockburn it was mentioned that the problem could be that there was not enough planting done in the initial design and that it now is a bland area.

Respondents mentioned that they wished that they had more information about the original design intent, in particular in relation to planting. Respondents believed that ‘...Gibberd just planted, and sketched the planting plan down only afterwards...rather only planting notes, which are hard to follow. For example, for a rose he would just write the letter ‘R’, but no further detail. Gibberd probably felt compelled to keep records, but his head was somewhere else...’. The lack of notes also results in problems of identification, which gardeners now faced at Falkland Palace.

### 8.5.2 The influence of design on opinions

The survey responses confirmed that the design of landscapes of the recent past play a major role in influencing people’s opinions about these landscapes. A variety of factors that relate to design were mentioned by respondents as impacting people’s opinions. In total 29.59% of the responses to the questions about people’s opinions related to materials and designs. The factors that were raised in the responses in relation to design are summarised hereafter. Factors relating to materials are described later.

**Not aesthetical pleasing design and the lack of originality influence opinions**

Respondents highlighted that the fact that designs are often not aesthetically pleasing contributes to poor opinions about these landscapes. From the responses it transpired that many people regard designs from the recent past as ‘...too strong, in your face, or too angular...’. Others find that they are too bland and merely landscaping, or that
these landscapes lack cohesion in design, and are often more practical than aesthetically pleasing. Respondents used expressions such as dull, ugly, horrible and horrific. A respondent felt that the ugly buildings at the University of Stirling Campus spoiled the beautiful landscape of the campus and as a result felt it was depressing to live there. An interviewee spoke about Bannockburn saying that he finds it ‘…a singularly dull place which holds no appeal to myself, both in terms of the landscape and the structures within…’ and that it does not enhance the visitor experience.

Responses also hinted that some people find that much modern landscaping, like much of our modern architecture, lacks real originality and creativity. A respondent sees as a reason that there has not been enough focus on creative new design and more attention has been paid to renovation and renewal. A respondent thought that especially in the United Kingdom there are low opinions because in his opinion landscape design is done so badly in comparison with for example the Netherlands and Germany. Another respondent made similar comparisons and believes that our largely visually illiterate public and media to an extent results from ‘…the detachment of the architectural profession, with its long art-school training, as a mysterious cult…’. He compared this with the public attitudes to architecture in Scandinavia and Northern Europe with more open technical-high school based traditions.

**A tendency to over design and impractical designs influence opinions**

Respondents also spoke about the tendency to over design, rather than considering the practical and useful elements, as an important factor that contributes to poor perception. For example, the 1960s were described by a respondent as a period of freedom of expression and very confrontational, with designers trying to shock people. This respondent missed, however, the practicality and functionality in those designs and felt that too many sites were never built fit for purpose. A respondent was of the opinion that designers seemed to have behaved as if they are larger than landscape and as a result they often destroyed something that was maybe a lot better if left to nature.
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Fig. 57: Subtle, minimal landscaping around the house at High Sutherland (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 58: Detail of the paths and a stone wall at High Sutherland, a residence designed by Peter Womersley (Author’s photograph).
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An older respondent recalled when some of these places were constructed, that people where often appalled and ashamed of what was build. They felt that it was dreadful and that now time often has proven that it is ugly. In Cumbernauld some residents that were interviewed said that they are at times ashamed to say where we live as the town never fulfilled its promise.

An interesting and contrasting example is High Sutherland (Fig. 58 and Fig. 58) were a respondent felt that no landscaping was involved and that the house just stands on land that, with exception of some trees, was totally unaltered from the way it was in 1955. The result is very pleasing, but in fact such a subtle touch with just a minimum on new planting, some functional paved areas and a driveway must also be seen as landscape design. A respondent concluded that ‘…there are some very good, successful well-known designers, and an awful lot of rubbish ones…’.

**Designs that do not fit in influence opinions**

Closely linked to the designs not being aesthetically pleasing, a response given is that designs at times do not fit in, detract, or are out of proportion with their surroundings. Again this is seen as a factor that contributes to poor perception of landscapes of the recent past. A respondent said that the existing landscape assets are ignored with the result that ‘…new landscapes seem to have been imposed upon, rather than to have grown out of the existing landscape. Sometimes certain features appear out of place or inappropriate, such as the rotunda at Bannockburn. People that go to Bannockburn have a romanticised view of Bannockburn but they find modern features and are confused and disappointed that they find structures that were built in their lifetime.

The opinions of some interviewed residents in the Kildrum neighbourhood of Cumbernauld also highlighted how the setting itself was well used for the overall effect. A respondent spoke about the landscape context at Falkland House and Falkland Palace Garden within the context of the post war movement. He explained how here the modernist trends were not just followed, but the spirit of the place was taken into consideration. Percy Cane took the setting and the fabric of the place into account and as a result it all seemed to make sense. A respondent also felt that if there was too much interference with nature, things did not work and concluded that where the natural landscape is significant, the garden should complement it, but in some cases new soft and hard landscaping could be more prominent.
**Design that does not take buildings into consideration influence opinions**

Just as design should complement the landscape it should also take existing buildings on the site into consideration. Where this is not the case the result is poor, and this may influence opinions. A respondent spoke of the example of the new Scottish Parliament building where the building fits within the context of the land and also the landscaping and building echoes the shapes of the hills behind it (Fig. 59 and Fig. 60). Opinions are always subjective and other respondents thought that the landscaping at the new Scottish Parliament was poor and had nothing to do with the place and Scotland.

**Places not created at the right scale for people influence opinions**

A respondent thought that landscape architects appeared to be capable of looking at the bigger picture, the context, much more than garden designers. He added though that in doing so they often failed to create things at the right scale and were often ‘...working on such a large scale that it does not relate to a human...’. They would have visions but ‘...it would take a hundred years to come to that. It possibly would be vandalised before it got to that. In reality it was just a pretty picture. It had no connection with the people themselves...’. Landscape architects, said a respondent, ‘...do a nice picture, something you can hang against the wall and say that it looks absolutely lovely...’, while garden designers look at all detail and have a subtler approach.

**Design style influences opinions**

A respondent doubted that the public realised the date of a landscape design, especially because many recent landscapes were designed in traditional styles. She believed that the design style and quality remains key to appreciation, rather than the date of creation:

‘...Is it not the emptiness, sterile atmosphere and over-intellectual interpretation that is difficult to grasp that creates this ‘dislike’ or feeling of artificialness? I think multi-dimensional i.e. emotional as intellectually encouraging, but not challenging designed landscapes of any date will always be more/better received than functional/artificial areas that are rather excluding then including the visitor...’.
Fig. 59: The landscaping around the Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 60: The Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh by Enric Miralles (Author’s photograph).
The example of Dunbar’s Close Garden, which was redesigned in the 1960s in a traditional fashion, illustrates this point. A respondent said that locals did not want a modern garden, but one with a reference to the site, so in the end a traditional design was opted for. Even though it is a new garden design it still is much appreciated.

**Low opinion is often associated with urban landscaping**

The survey indicated that there are different opinions about public and private landscapes and gardens. Private gardens from the recent past are more often seen as being very good, while public parks from recent past are seen as in general of poorer standards. Respondents in general said that people have little appreciation of post war urban landscapes. They referred to them as being ‘Brutalist’, harder, and associated urban landscaping with its social problems. A respondent thought that potentially the landscaping industry is still suffering in the public eye because of the reputation it gained during the 1970s and early 1980s.

Many respondents pointed the finger at city councils and find that the reasons for poor urban landscaping was due to the poor and unimaginative work by councils. A respondent explained that the commonest experience of landscape architecture for most people is in towns and cities, but that sadly ‘...it has largely been abysmal...’ in these areas, with many ‘...ugly and unhealthy no-go areas for pedestrians...’. Another respondent believes that it had been an aim in post war landscapes to secure a lot of green open space for people. Having few undulations and plant beds facilitated the maintenance of these landscapes but ‘...it doesn’t invite access and can become an uninviting no-mans land...’. A respondent did however not see this as a justifiable reason and believes that large open leisure spaces with vast areas of lawn with some trees and flowerbeds could be really beautiful, depending on how well they were designed.

**More positive responses about gardens**

Respondents felt that people often have a more positive opinion about gardens of the recent past than about landscaping in public spaces and especially larger modern landscapes. For example, a respondent believes that the majority of successful projects have been driven by private individuals and companies, rather than the public sector. He said that ‘...gardens have a different kind of, somehow mindset, to what I suppose is landscape architecture. People respond far more positively when they are
told that they ought to go and look at this garden rather than being told to go and see this designed landscape...'. He mentioned the case of Little Sparta and said that even though there are architectural elements, and Ian Hamilton Finlay's '...minimalism that comes from his concrete modernist thinking about poetry and language...', it is in the context of a garden, were it works well. Another respondent agreed that there has been more continuing interest in landscape architecture for private gardens and landscaping, but finds that only few examples of innovative designs were created, Little Sparta being one of the rare examples.

When speaking about the huge difference between urban landscaping and private grounds a respondent mentioned how it appears that in the post war period the quality deteriorated in public spaces, while in the private sector the opposite took place. The relationship between quality and available money was raised within this context. A respondent spoke of examples where big houses had to find the money and they did find it, and we saw improvements, while in other cases the local authority lost funding support and standards deteriorated. Suddenly landscaping was something that went with the house, and money was spent, and the quality in the private sector improved but in the public sector deteriorated. A respondent spoke with some optimism and thinks that slowly that balance is returning.

Because landscape takes second place people believe it is not relevant
Another reason given for why design influences low opinions is the fact that landscapes do not get the same level of respect in the design and construction process as buildings. Some said that only minor considerations are given to landscape design by planners and developers and all attention and money goes to the buildings, rather then the context in which it stands. A respondent summed up the problem:

‘...I think the reason there is a low opinion is that people do not respect landscape. In so much that what is done it is a minor consideration in the minds of planners and developers. They feel that the building is the important thing, the actual development itself, rather than its context. Context does not really rate high enough...’

An interviewed landscape architect, agreed with this and described the issue by saying that:
‘...we are so unwilling to spend money on the landscape, we do not develop the refined skills of the landscape as being as important as the build structure, and it will always take second best. It will always have the lowest budget, and being at the end of the contract it always get cut down to nothing. Therefore people look at it and say; well, landscape is not really relevant, is it?...’.

A respondent thought that as a result there are few good examples of landscaping, and most of what we see is of a low quality, leading to low opinions about landscaping by the wider public. Another respondent made a similar comment within the context of Bannockburn where he felt that there is landscaping, but ‘...too little is done, only the bare minimum, with little planting, and merely landscape...’. One respondent finds it all a self-defeating thing. He feels that lots of people are not educated enough and have not seen enough, to know that it can be done better. Other respondents agreed that the public is not educated enough about landscaping and that they do not know good design from bad, so they think all is bad. Someone came to similar conclusions about the lack of respect for landscape, but added that he believed that slowly things were turning and that landscape architects appear to be gaining greater respect ‘...from both other professionals and society as whole, albeit slowly, for the contribution they make to the quality of life for the general populous...’.

Criticism as a result of association with poor architecture

Closely linked to the lack of respect for landscapes and the fact that it always takes second place is the fact that landscape architecture of the recent past is often associated with the poor architecture of that era. For example, when looking at the case study of Cumbernauld New Town it was mentioned that the disastrous outcome of the centre of the town had resulted in all the rest also being declared problematic and unpleasing. A respondent was nevertheless of the opinion that many of the neighbourhoods in Cumbernauld and its landscaping are now very appreciated, even though the wider public thinks all is ugly and bad in Cumbernauld. He explained how he believes that there are all sorts of alienations about landscape architecture:

‘...Because landscape architecture is associated with a particular time of building. Which over the last fifteen years has come to be perceived as a landscape of anomie rather than a landscape of blissful settlement ... What are people thinking of? Motorway embankments, the green bits around tower blocks. Are they
thinking of the fact that you need to get a bridge over a dual carriageway or something, and the bridge is problematic because youths hang out on it?...

### 8.5.3 Challenges associated with materials and planting

Closely related and often integral to challenges caused by the original design are issues that people are now confronted with in relation to materials, planting and equipment.

#### Poor materials and construction

Several respondents raised this as a concern. For example, one respondent worried about the leakage of a pond at Little Sparta, while another respondent spoke about the ugly buildings in Cumbernauld that in her opinion diminish the quality of the landscaping. A respondent believed that the focus was at times more on quantity than quality and thought that problems at Bannockburn arise from the quality of the original construction. A respondent gave the rotunda at Bannockburn as an example and said that the Sir Robert Matthew’s original design was for a circular timber-faced structure.
like a motte (Fig. 61). Dr Eric Stevenson, who was associated with Matthew for a time, interpreted the concept as a solid structure and unfortunately it was built with concrete blocks to reduce costs Fig. 24 and Fig. 70.

![Fig. 62: The Gibberd Garden’s Castle and Moat makes use of experimental materials (Author’s photograph).](image)

**Materials cause practical challenges**

Respondents felt that practical conservation were caused by the type of materials that were used, such as at the Gibberd Garden where concrete was used for the castle and moat feature (Fig. 62). Similarly at Little Sparta, some respondents mentioned that the wooden sculptures pose conservation issues, a problem that the Gibberd Garden Trust also faces. A respondent thought that due to natural processes of weathering and
decay some difficult decisions will need to be taken about ‘...maintaining existing features, replacing them in due course with facsimiles, or allowing them to fall naturally into decay...’. At Little Sparta the harsh climate and elements are also seen as hindering the conservation of the garden. A respondent summed it up by saying that ‘...it is a living space and breathes, so changes very quickly...’.

**Practical challenges of planting**

Respondents mentioned several problems and practical challenges they faced in relation to planting at sites. At Falkland Palace Garden the original design included a Lupin border (Fig. 63), which was fashionable in the 1950s. A respondent mentioned that diseases and unavailability of plants have caused a need for change, and given the circumstances she did not see a problem in replacing the plants with species that achieve similar form and tonal values. Another respondent was less certain and wondered ‘...how far should we go back to the original Percy Cane plan, and when is there a good reason to change it?...’. Closely relating to this is that at times people appear to value planting less given the fact that it is less than fifty years old. For example, one respondent thought that at one garden the planting had no unusual value due to its relative young age.

Issues relating to renewal of planting schemes were mentioned in the responses. One respondent spoke about the need for regular cycles of replacements to retain scale and visual relationships at Little Sparta. There was a feeling that Ian Hamilton Finlay maybe had tried to develop Little Sparta at a quicker rate than usual, and had planted everything very close, possibly to create a feeling of security. A respondent said that there are now people who want every tree replaced, but he does not believe that would work.

Respondents mentioned that interpreting the intentions of creators, such as Ian Hamilton Finlay, for the purpose of replanting can pose complex challenges. A respondent mentioned how at Little Sparta at times trees were planted that featured in some of Finlay’s poems, but at other times Finlay played with irony such as where he says ‘bring back the birch’. Here there are no birches planted but you look for the birch trees that are not there. A respondent explained how that is how Finlay plays on your thoughts with words, and interpreting that in the future will pose difficult challenges.
Other dilemmas that relate to planting or trees are more conventional, such as in Cumbernauld where trees now cause root damage and tripping hazards. Interviewed residents thought that too many trees were planted, something a former designer had agreed with. They said that the Council only takes trees down when there is a safety risk. The respondents complained about this saying that the council people do not have to live here.

8.5.4 The influence of materials on opinions

From the survey it was also clear that the type and quality of materials used in landscape architecture from the recent past, together with the practical maintenance challenges of such materials, strongly influence people’s opinions of these landscapes. Factors that influence this are summarised hereafter.

The fast and poor rate of construction influences opinions

Some respondents referred to the fast and poor rate of construction after the Second World War with poor materials as a factor that influences people’s opinions. A
respondent thought that rationing of materials and the materials being used for the war effort must have diminished what was available. Another respondent agrees that the gardens of the immediate post war period reflected a period of poverty and lack of resources. Similarly, another respondent concluded that in the post war period there were too many cheap and quick fixes, rather than a focus on high aesthetic standard.

**Materials that do not sit comfortably with people and a dislike for concrete influence opinions**

Respondents also felt that because many of the materials used do not sit comfortably with the wider public, that this influences people’s opinions. They feel that such materials are in contrast to some of the traditional materials that are very pleasing and sit very easy with the public. A respondent described this as the ‘odd look’ of a place. A interviewee described how he felt that the materials used for the buildings at the University of Stirling campus appeared a bit ‘schizophrenic’ and ‘claustrophobic’ (Fig. 48). A respondent at Suntrap Garden said that she liked the philosophy and history behind Sir Robert Matthew’s design for the modern house at Suntrap but that she does not like its concrete appearance and is concerned that many unhealthy materials were used. A respondent also was of the opinion that ‘…concrete does not have that feel good factor…it is not the most appealing of products at all…’. Maybe often the designs were functional, but the 1960s ‘…was very concrete…’ and it is ‘…just not terribly attractive to the eye…’. In the garden of Falkland Palace concrete was only used in the Rose Garden, which was for one respondent the reason why a problem with concrete does not exist there. Other respondents thought that they get used to concrete or were of the opinion that with concrete there is a degree of softening that is needed to make it work. They felt that this is where sympathetic planting comes in handy, such as spiky, angular plants. A respondent felt that these work well with concrete, but was of the opinion that concrete against a traditional herbaceous border does not work. At Portrack, the Garden of Cosmic Speculation, contemporary materials have also been used and respondents voiced mixed opinions about various materials (Fig. 64). Nevertheless the garden is extremely popular.

**Lack of connection between place and material influence opinions**

In addition to a dislike for concrete, another respondent pointed out that a key problem is that often there was no connection between the materials used and the place it was used. Often it was ‘…done with big blocks of concrete, big chunks of wood or stone,
connections had gone, like plastic chairs in classic houses…’. A respondent felt that such lack of connection also was of importance within the context of the link between the local climate and the type of materials used. In the case of Scotland she thought that the climate is less kind to concrete than in a sunnier climate, and there is ‘…discolouration and brutal ugliness…’ as a result. Similarly students at the University of Stirling that were interviewed had concerns about the use of flat roofs in a climate such as Scotland’s. Their responses illustrate how people often link impractical design with non-aesthetical design: ‘…I just do not like flat roofs. It is totally unpractical. It just makes things an eyesore on campus…’.

**Poor materials in combination with poor maintenance influence opinions**

Some respondents also mentioned how they feel that the problems associated with the frequent use of poor of materials in landscapes of the recent past are not helped by the poor maintenance of these materials, or the absence of timely repairs or renovation work. Respondents were of the opinion that this will further influence poor perception of landscapes of the recent past.

Fig. 64: Challenging designs with the use of contemporary materials at Portrack, the Garden of Cosmic Speculation (Author’s photograph).
Use of narrow range of plants influence opinions
Some respondents believe that the narrow range of plants used and the use of inappropriate species has also resulted in unintended and unfortunate results, which now also contribute to poor opinions about landscapes of the recent past. A comment was that social issues and safety objectives, together with the aim to minimise maintenance costs, often determined the use of plants.

8.6 Shortcoming in conservation planning and development processes

As highlighted in Chapter Three, the conservation process of designed landscapes consists of two main parallel processes, namely, conservation maintenance and stewardship, and conservation planning and research (Coffin and Belavia, 1998). The planning process enables the proper understanding and assessment of the site to allow the development of long-term aims and objectives. This should be done through consultation and involvement of stakeholders and partners. From the literature review it was also clear that the importance of following established conservation processes and principles was also raised in several existing recommendations. The case study survey validated the need for recommendations and actions on this theme as about 17.97% of all items raised in the responses brought up concerns or shortcomings relating to the conservation planning and development processes for landscapes of the recent past and the case study sites.

8.6.1 Issues with the planning process and understanding

Several key concerns that relate to planning and understanding were raised.

Lack of attention and inaction at sites
First of all, some respondents voiced concerns about the lack of planning and inaction at sites. One respondent spoke about the situation of Cumbernauld and how ‘…people are absolutely convinced that North Lanarkshire is systematically letting bits of their town fall to pieces…’. He described the situation as being worrisome and ‘…like a pampered child being taken away from its previous parents and given to a slum family…’ and that ‘…North Lanarkshire oppression, and neglect…’ was much to blame
for the running down of the place. In Bannockburn a respondent spoke of similar concerns and that the people who are responsible continue to push the timetable to address the issues back. She said that ‘…there is part of the National Trust for Scotland that overlooks, that does not really bother…’, and felt that the site could not sustain this and was worried that soon there might not be anything left worth saving.

**Ad-hoc planning and the absence of conservation visions**

Other respondents worried about ad-hoc planning processes. At Bannockburn a respondent was concerned that there is no clear direction about what they are trying to do at all, and felt that everything was done in an ad-hoc manner. The respondent now feels that the site is ‘…just very messy. That has probably been since the National Trust for Scotland has been involved in the site. It has never been well thought through at all. For something that is supposed to be the most iconic symbol of Scotland and its nationhood it is quite scary…’. As a reason for this the respondent felt that at the site the Trust was trying to keep everyone happy, but were actually not achieving anything. As an example the respondent said that when the Trust were asked by neighbours to cut down trees, that do not need to come down, they will still fell the trees. Bannockburn clearly needs direction through proper management planning statements.

An essential aspect of the conservation of places is a proper conservation plan or vision. At several sites respondents were concerned about the absence of such vision or the way a plan developed. One respondent felt that sometimes people were in too much of a hurry and that time must be taken to develop a conservation vision, while another respondent saw issues in the initial brief that was given to the consultants for the conservation and development vision. It allowed significant features to be demolished. The respondent therefore raised the need and importance of a proper heritage assessment and impact assessment of proposals. Some respondents were concerned about issues with the monitoring and reviewing of progress.

Several gardeners responded that without clear visions they did not know what to do on site. Respondents felt that they had ‘…nothing to work from…’ or wished for ‘…some sort of guidelines which capture the essence of the place, the spirit of the place…’. A respondent recognised that at Falkland Palace there is the Percy Cane design, the Arts and Crafts style of gardening, but she was not clear how to maintain these Twentieth Century design features. Another respondent had similar problems
and asked ‘...do we keep it the way it is, or do we go back to the original concept...’.

One respondent wanted to see a mission, vision and objectives for the garden and described how at another site, in desperation, a consultant was employed because ‘...not knowing how on earth we were going to keep this place going...’. He added that each property has to be taken on its own merit and everything needs to be seen in a holistic way and with long-term planning. For this respondent it is also clear that you cannot get any funding these days unless you show a long-term plan, or ‘...how are you going to attract the people, what will you do with them when they want to visit again? What are the cards that you offer?...’.

Lack of understanding and recording oral history

Key to the development of conservation visions is a full understanding of the place and its history or as a respondent remarked, ‘...planning decisions must be adequately informed...’. Another respondent highlighted how decisions should be based on research, but sadly many respondents spoke of their concerns on this subject at the case study sites. Several respondents mentioned that decisions are not always based on a proper study and understanding of the site, and that decisions do not always take into account the significance and values of sites. For example, some highlighted that often decisions are taken without a proper knowledge of the original designer. Time constraints in projects were raised as a concern by respondents as deadlines did often not allow for sufficient research and analysis.

At Bannockburn a respondent was of the opinion that the rotunda structure and landscaping concept had been dismissed in the development proposals of 2004 because of the lack of proper research. An interviewee also worried about this and finds that to the controlling organisation ‘...the true value of the site has to be paramount...’. At the Gibberd Garden a respondent mentioned how archives where not easily accessible until recently and that there was a lack of circulation of information, which contributed to poor understanding.

Within the context of research the importance of recording oral history was highlighted in the responses. A respondent at the Gibberd Garden mentioned in the interview that they had spoken to the family to record some of their memories and what they remembered about the evolution of the garden. The case study survey itself confirmed how interviews help to gather oral history. While this was not the core aim of the
survey, the interviews at the Gibberd Garden resulted in recording opinions of those involved at present and the previous owner. An example of a useful statement about the original design intent is that ‘…[Gibberd’s] ideas should be predominant in future planning. The stream should be re-instated as a priority, it is such an important part of the design and was so beautiful. His planting ideas, too, should be followed, block planting, using different plants in different parts of the garden. A general sympathy for the shape and ideas of the garden…’.

Fig. 65: Intrusive housing developments at the edge of the Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Site (Author’s photograph).

**The importance of the site’s setting**

Another important concern that was raised by respondents was that conservation planning must take the wider setting into account. Frustrations were voiced that at times nothing can be done to preserve the setting. For example at Bannockburn a respondent mentioned the difficulty of ‘…fighting off the encroachment of building at the margins…’ and believes that ‘…an embargo on any further intrusions onto the site would be a good start…’. Another respondent agrees and finds that Bannockburn is not helped by ‘…the planning authorities indifference to the setting and the historical
context...in allowing development at critical locations on the margins of the site...’ (Fig. 65) Someone interviewed at the Gibberd Garden spoke about similar concerns of housing development near the site, while at Little Sparta the erection of windmills nearby were mentioned as a threat. A respondent finds this particularly worrisome as at Little Sparta ‘...the garden design gains a lot from its contrast to the harsh Pentland Hills...’. He therefore believes that in conserving the garden, its surroundings should be included in the preservation planning and project.

**Challenges when the concept and vision failed**

While several respondents spoke about how establishing a new vision can be a major challenge, some also mentioned the problems associated with visions that did fail. For example, at Cumbernauld the real problem was thought to be that ‘...the concept collapsed and it is difficult to see how there is going to be a solution...’. A respondent is of the opinion that at Cumbernauld ‘...in many ways the key issue is not the matter of means, but the matter of approach...’. Another interviewee at Bannockburn noted similar challenges and was not sure how to tackle a vision or concept, when the concept had failed.

**The inconvenience of development**

While respondents agree that development must occur at times, some voiced their concerns with the inconvenience of such activities. For example, a respondent at Bannockburn saw problems of inconvenience in having to think about ‘...building a new centre and doing some significant work to the site...’ and that potentially the site will have to be closed for a while.

**8.6.2 Development versus original design**

As part of conservation projects for sites, new design elements are frequently proposed and developed. In the responses several comments were made about how this poses, at times, complex challenges.

**Retaining design integrity but allowing for change**

Respondents felt that too often new proposals were not based on a good understanding of the original concept and that as a result design integrity and the holistic vision of the site became lost. At Bannockburn a respondent felt that at present
Some respondent revisited fundamental conservation philosophies when saying that ‘...an assessment and listing of the key structural elements of the landscape whose integrity are most important to conserve, together with an archived set of documents relating to the designers’ intentions, could provide the basis for future protection...’. A respondent at the Gibberd Garden agreed, saying that ‘...the statement of significance should acknowledge all the qualities, values and features that were part of Gibberd’s ideal, plus the intrinsic and acquired qualities of the site...’.

**Alterations and development versus original design**

A respondent pointed out that it is not always easy to keep the original vision going as opposed to going along with fashion, but ‘...we have to draw lines, judge what the public wants...’. Speaking about change someone quoted the former American
President Lincoln who once said that ‘...too many people misunderstand progress for change, knowledge for wisdom...’. He believes that if you can understand that and see progress not just change, that you can do something great. Another respondent also acknowledges that in formulating future policy, the original design should be taken into consideration, but knowing that every site is different, highlighted that in an urban area, such as for example Cumbernauld, the well-being of the community must be taken into account. The respondent also finds that gardens must be allowed to grow and move on, and feels that retaining the feel of a particular design is more important than continuing to struggle with particular designated plants that will not grow well at the site. A respondent recalled how at Falkland Palace Garden the National Trust for Scotland caused the demise of the herbaceous border. They tried ‘...to purify the border to the Percy Cane design and layout, but that backlashed...’ as it changed ‘...the dimensions and weight of the border to the detriment of the garden...’. Someone mentioned similar issues with the rotunda at Bannockburn and is of the opinion that ‘...if reduction to the original design is not an option it ought to be demolished and replaced by a good contemporary design...’, but another respondent warned against ‘...change for the sake of change...’ at significant sites. A gardener said in his response that ‘...as gardeners we are always aware to not touch it if it looks nice, if it is aesthetically fine. When you do change it is because of other pressures, adapting, accesses, change of the curriculum. And change because of new ideas...’. Another respondent pointed out the fact that in the end ‘...conservation is facilitated by the place remaining in use...’ and where necessary that does mean that new uses for a place must be found, and that alterations will be required.

**Ongoing development at recent landscapes**

Respondents raised some complications in conservation at sites where the creator or designer is still alive and still develops the site. For example, in the case of Portrack one respondent described that ‘...many elements have been squeezed into the site, some more successfully than others, so it would be appropriate for any protection to allow some flexibility in conserving what is there and allowing for further change in future...’. Other respondents feel that at Portrack ‘...we cannot really speak about conservation...when the creator still has the opportunity himself to alter any detail or deliberately neglect any part of his own garden. This itself will become part of the site’s history, and we must understand it...’. Someone responded saying that the owner even ‘...has the right to neglect it if he wants...’. Other respondents stated similar opinions.
and that in such circumstances the private owner’s views are most significant, and that decisions will reflect owner’s wishes, but that this therefore does not mean that it was the most appropriate option.

8.6.3 Issues with what is driving planning and development decisions

In the case study survey respondents were asked in Question 7 about what and who is driving the conservation process. As illustrated in Table 4.7, a total of thirty-six responses or 4.46% of all responses directly related to this theme. Table 4.9 illustrates how of the thirty-six responses 30.56% mentioned issues in the planning and development process. These responses give an indication of some of the main concerns that people have about decision-making processes.

Funding driven planning decisions

Under concerns about finance and budgets it has already been mentioned that a concern of respondents was that development is often funding driven. Similarly concerns were raised that given that projects are at times funding driven, planning and research is often not done well, with deadlines for funding applications often resulting in rushed planning decisions, or the availability of funding resulting in the stagnation of planning, decisions and projects.

The importance of the right management structures and balance of expertise

In order to deliver good landscape design projects also require good project structures and management. Respondents spoke about how this often goes wrong, with funding driven approaches, poor project management, lack of consultation and timetables that are too tight. A concern raised was that external project management teams have often too much control over decisions, and that decision makers often lack expertise and skills, and an understanding of the site’s history and significance. A worry was also that decisions are too often influenced by vested interest.

Within this context several respondents gave examples of concerns about the right balance of expertise in planning and development processes. A respondent was of the opinion that assessments should be undertaken by experienced landscape architects or landscape historians, through research into the history of the site. Another respondent also believes that sites deserve public interest, but in the end experts
should handle the conservation. Someone described this by saying ‘...let the right people do the conservation job, or take the decisions...’ and warns about having people make decisions who do not like a particular style such as modernism.

At some sites respondents mentioned that given the complexity of the work, and the specific need for understanding of landscapes of the recent past, more or better advisory support for their work would be welcomed. A respondent believes that gardens such as the Gibberd Garden need a qualified and experienced gardens adviser to help decide on priority and give objectivity to decision-making. Another interviewee believes in a system where advisers maintain an interest and watching brief, so that if a trust proved ineffective or was seen to be taking decisions which posed a threat to the character and integrity of a garden, their involvement can be renewed.

Some respondents at Little Sparta said that it was vital that people represented on the Little Sparta Trust, with an important advisory role, are ‘...chosen for their particular knowledge and skills, and their passion for the site, or interest in the garden, rather than simply as representatives of interested organisations (though the presence of some of these can be helpful)...’. A respondent at Bannockburn agreed with this and said that people are needed ‘...that actually know what they are talking about. You can have people giving you ideas, but not practical...’. In the case study of Little Sparta someone added that a balance must be struck between ‘...those interested in the conservation of Ian Hamilton Finlay’s artistic legacy, represented in the collection of artworks to be found at Little Sparta, and those with the necessary knowledge and skills effectively to steer the management of the living elements of the garden for the foreseeable future. A lack of attention to either aspect of the garden is likely to result in problems...’. With this in mind a respondent voiced a concern that past membership of the Little Sparta Trust appeared ‘...to have tended towards the fine arts rather than the gardens end of the spectrum, risking inappropriate management of the garden...’. At Bannockburn a respondent believed that the National Trust for Scotland did not use a conservation architect to develop the new proposals in 2004. Such an expert would have recognised that Robert Matthew had been involved in the creation of the rotunda. A holistic approach was needed but this was not the case. When the rotunda was suddenly listed by Historic Scotland in 2004, conservation experts were blamed by the
project team and further excluded from involvement in the project, which is completely against conservation principles of the National Trust for Scotland.

**Risk of developer led development**

Respondents gave examples of inappropriate changes or developments as a result of developer led development. For example, at Cumbernauld a respondent thought that the policy for the town was driven by the prospect of development. He sees the town centre as ‘...a redevelopment area where much has been lost. It is now a hopeless case as development is developer led...’. Another respondent agreed that property developers are driving the future of the site. Also someone said that the residential areas are at risk from ‘...ad-hoc and piecemeal “improvements” leading to loss of overall design concept. The idea of “developer contributions to the community” could be dangerous unless carefully managed and controlled...’. A respondent found that ‘...the planners do their best but they do not have the power in the system to do anything. There is a commercial interest but they are not really driving any landscape or conservation process at all...’. To resolve this damaging situation one respondent is of the opinion that the development corporation should be re-established with appropriate representation from heritage and design agencies and the local community.

**Design led approaches, famous designers and the inappropriateness of design competitions**

When speaking about redevelopments at sites respondents mentioned concerns with projects that were design led. For example at Bannockburn, the proposals for a new development project were prepared by an external design team (Fig. 66, Fig. 67 and Fig. 68) (Allan Murray Architects, 2004). An interviewee felt that the design of the building, the proposed materials, landscaping and artwork was not satisfactory. With external consultants involved and a project driven by commercial interest and design people, the opinions of the people on site were not taken into account enough. The staff on site saw serious impracticalities of managing such facilities and within the context of what National Trust for Scotland tried to do at the site. The respondent said that design practices were less interested in these issues and were more concerned with getting their ‘state of the art’ design constructed.
In relation to designer-led approaches another respondent mentioned that many developers or decision takers often wish to involve famous designers without really understanding what these designers were good at. Some respondent described how they feel that political motives, political agendas and vested interests are often behind such decisions. A respondent believed that developers and clients mostly do not want sympathetic schemes or sensitive proposals, but they want a product. He referred to it as the desire for clients to go for the ‘…wham-bang-thank-you-mam…’ approach. This respondent believes that design should not be about the designer, but about the designer forgetting they exist, but added that sadly this is almost an impossible thing to sell to a client. In the case of the city councils he thought that it is because they do not see that as an investment because they cannot sell it to the people.

Designers also often wish to sell their trademark style and that therefore is not appropriate for the particular site. Such designers are at times good in a particular type of landscape architecture or in designs for certain climates or countries, but therefore
not for the particular site. A respondent referred to the example of Enric Miralles who designed very deep dark spaces in between the buildings of the new Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh. While this concept would possibly work in Spain, the respondent thought that this would not be suitable in the long-term in Scotland. A respondent finds that opinions about landscape architecture have been influenced by the fact that subtle approaches are often not welcome in projects.

Some of the respondents had major concerns about the use of design competitions to decide on the proposals for change. Someone responded that ‘…a sensitive adoption of a building, or a sensitive adoption of the rest or landscape will not win a competition…’. Clients too often go for the big impact design proposals, but which are mostly not suitable for the site. A respondent found that the existing concept at Bannockburn did not lend itself to a competition, but nevertheless the National Trust for Scotland decided in 2004 on a designer, based on competitive design presentations by invited firms. The respondent believes that subtle, sensitive approaches mostly receive no support, while such sensitive design approaches are required, rather than the big impact design ideas and architectural statements that are often selected. He added that sadly ‘…if you want funding, you need a big sexy idea to get Heritage Lottery Funding or Scottish Executive funding. Not the sensitive idea…’. A respondent felt that for conservation projects, competitions are therefore far from ideal as they need in general sensitive proposals, but he was of the opinion that this is in the United Kingdom not respected.

8.6.4 The influence of planning and development processes on opinions

Responses in the survey indicated that issues with planning and development influence in various ways people’s opinions about landscapes of the recent past. A respondent was of the opinion that many landscapes that were created in the recent past were of high quality but later intrusions have spoiled many of these landscapes. An interviewee spoke about the process of planning at Bannockburn as being a ‘jumble’. She described how management had allowed part of the site to be sold for playing fields while also a bowling club sits right in the middle of the site. Another respondent expressed her strong opinion about planning having gone wrong by saying that if we could just ‘…blow up everything one night, we would not have to worry about it anymore…’.
Fig. 67: The Bannockburn development proposals from 2004 included a tower and helmet-like visitor centre (Allan Murray Architects, 2004).

Fig. 68: The initial masterplan for the Bannockburn redevelopment proposals from 2004 included a saltire-like landscaping layout (Allan Murray Architects, 2004).
Also in Cumbernauld respondents complained about the impact of the sale of public spaces to private developers. A respondent thought that the original landscaping was good but private builders are responsible for poor alterations. Another interviewee explained how already during the development of Cumbernauld changes were made to the original design concepts that meant that the scheme no longer worked well. Additions are often made to turn architecture that initially was functional and practical again into architecture that is most functional for current needs. Respondents mentioned that this is not always done with success and the sites at times lose much of their charm. Some respondents thought that the problem is often that developers and managers now do not see and understand how it looked when it was just built. This is also ironic because demolition played a major part in the development of some of the new utopian schemes from the recent past. A respondent reflected on how many people were shocked in the post war era when sympathetic architecture and landscaping was getting demolished to be replaced by Brutalist schemes.

8.7 Challenges with consulting and involving people

In the literature review written sources were analysed to establish the key stakeholders in the conservation of landscapes of the recent past. The outcome was summarised in Table 3.3 in Chapter Two and established seven main categories of stakeholders. The case study survey provided an opportunity to validate and cross-examine these finding with the opinions of people involved in the conservation of sites, and verify what some key concerns are in relation with involving and consulting these stakeholders in the conservation process of sites.

8.7.1 Responses relating to who should be involved and consulted

Question 7 of the questionnaire in the case study survey asked respondents who they thought should be involved and consulted in the conservation process. The gathered responses were compared with the stakeholder categories as prepared in Table 3.3. The following overview sums up which stakeholders categories were mentioned by the respondents:

1. Agency or Government Organisations: Patrons, the government, arts councils, funding bodies
2. Charitable Trusts and Voluntary Organisations: Trustees, partners, organisations, trusts, charities, friends groups
3. Enterprises and Consultants: Tourist boards, specialists, experts, advisers, original designers, local enterprises, collaborators, developers, project managers, external project teams and project management

4. Day to Day Management: Owners, staff, creator

5. Wider Public and Visitors: Members, visitors, the wider public, stakeholders, local community and residents

6. Training and Educational Institutions: No specific mention

7. Private and Public Repositories: No specific mention

Of importance is that none of the respondents mentioned under Question 7 any stakeholders for the categories of training and educational institutions, and private and public repositories. This indicates that the role of training and educational institutions, and repositories is at times overlooked, particularly in the consultation and participation process. From the case study survey it was however clear that in the responses to the other questions of the questionnaire, several respondents did nevertheless mention the importance of the training of professionals and educational programmes, and the role of research and archives.

8.7.2 General concerns about the involvement of people

Respondents mentioned that there needs to be more consultation and involvement of the local community, so that they will take ‘ownership’ of the site because ‘…without their support it is really difficult to run any kind of service…’ . Absence of serious community involvement in the management of sites or project development results in a lack of ownership. Involving neighbours can also ‘...save a lot of hassle…’ because when they do not like something, they can be very vocal. Community involvement was also raised as being required to address prominent social issues, the lack of respect for sites and vandalism, which in turn seriously effect people’s opinions about certain sites.

A respondent saw a problem in the fact that local residents do not get involved when invited. She believes that this is often because people just do not find modernist gardens very attractive and prefer traditional looking gardens. Respondents thought that a problem is that some of the landscaping of the recent past just does not appeal to the wider public and does not inspire any support or sense of ownership. People see some of the iconic places and structures from this period as negative icons, rather than
positive, inspirational and uplifting heritage. Another respondent believes though that people hold much landscaping of the post war period in high esteem and will be willing to get involved in such sites.

Respondents felt at times that the voice of the community does not always get heard. For example, at Cumbernauld this was mentioned because locals find that the Housing Department does not listen to anything. Interviewed locals said that ‘…no one is interested, they are not even trying to be interested…’. Several respondents voiced a concern that decisions all too often appear top-down and that people with no interest in the site are seen to be responsible for the management decisions.

Interviewed staff at sites said that they wish a greater involvement, but they added that not everyone is clear about their roles in the consultation process. Respondents highlighted that while staff or landscape consultants are mostly invited to participate, the original designers of landscapes of the recent past are still rarely consulted. As they are still often alive, it would be a missed opportunity to not consult them during conservation or development processes.

Respondents mentioned that visitor surveys, questionnaires and other public forums should be used more to gather the views of the public, professionals and interested parties, including school groups and volunteer or friends groups. A concern raised was that before any new commercial proposals, local catering facilities, hotels and enterprises must be consulted. Respondents in general agreed that the more people that could be involved and consulted, the better, and that a holistic approach is needed, with the views of everyone taken into account.

Respondents did also raise that they wished that consultation could be constructive because ‘…we can sit around the table for years, but unless we achieve something we are wasting time…’.

8.7.3 The influence of involvement of people on public opinions about landscapes of the recent past

A significant conclusion in relation to the involvement of people is that respondents mentioned several examples which illustrate that the involvement, or lack of
involved of certain stakeholders also does influence people’s opinions about landscapes of the recent past. Similarly, some respondents thought that shortcomings in public consultation, and participation has influenced people’s opinions about designed landscapes. The key examples are summarised here.

**Actions of designers influenced opinions**

A respondent believes that at times in the recent past, everything had to be done quickly, and that often there was not enough thought about the future. Designers were often only interested in going forward, in a fast sense, and as a result designers came at times up with unrealistic, ideologically and even politically influenced ideas. Some respondents felt that such approaches have contributed towards shaping people’s opinions about landscapes from the recent past.

A respondent spoke about shortcomings in the scholarly way of thinking of designers versus a need for more intuitive thinking in landscape architecture. He believes that the low opinion of post war landscaping may have something to do with the formulaic and inflexible approach adopted by some landscape architects, sometimes with little regard to site and situation. One respondent referred to how designers have ignoring the human scale and have a poor understanding of how real people react to and use open spaces. Arrogance and ignorance is though not a thing of the past, believes another respondent, as there are many specialists in conservation who are not doing their jobs properly at present.

Another opinion voiced was that it should also not be forgotten that there were still very few trained and skilled designers in the early post war years and that architects without proper landscape training took on much work, often falling short of the mark. A respondent warned against blindly blaming the landscape architects for the poor quality of landscaping done, and still sees the failure to maintain landscapes in an appropriate way and with appropriate standards as the key reasons for low opinions.

**Actions by clients have an impact on opinions**

Issues that relate to the desires of clients to go for big impact schemes and less for subtle proposals have been mentioned, but were also seen by respondents as making an impact on perceptions. Another cause for concern raised is that clients were often faceless bureaucrats or disinterested developers, and that this does not benefit the
quality of new designed landscapes and the maintenance and management of existing sites. Respondents felt that city councils mostly say that they look for solutions, but showed little interest in looking for reasons and appeared to settle for easy answers such as the poor state that they feel they have inherited the site in.

**Criticism as a result of association with a person**

Respondents gave examples of criticism that was based on people’s association of sites to certain individuals. A respondent explained how he felt that people often denounce someone’s work without any reasons, purely because they associate someone, often wrongly, with something else they do not like. For example people were very happy to denounce Ian Hamilton Finlay for all sorts of things in the past. Nevertheless people had never had a bad experience with Little Sparta, but there was such an atmosphere generated by various factors. This respondent said that he was amazed of the viciousness of criticism of Ian Hamilton Finlay in the past, while ‘...people had not read anything, seen anything. They just thought he was a problem...’. Ultimately Ian Hamilton Finlay became an internationally recognised artist in the latter days of his life and public opinions are now positive about his work.

**8.8 Concerns about legal protection and politics**

About 4.58 per cent of the concerns raised by respondents related to legal protection and legislation. While in Chapter Six the findings of an analysis of the current status of registers and inventories was summarised, the responses of the case study survey allows for further validation and cross-examination of these findings. From the responses there is further evidence that there is still a need for better statutory protection, that listing is not always helpful and that politics surrounding sites continue to cause conflicts.

**Limited statutory protection**

In most cases respondents were not aware what type of protection status the case study site had. At Bannockburn respondents were aware of the A-listing of Historic Scotland of the key architectural features as this occurred just before the survey. A respondent had doubts whether this type of listing was effective as it focuses on built features, and less on the overall landscape concept. For Cumbernauld, where the overall urban plan and the landscaping had its significance, one respondent thought
that the absence of listing of Cumbernauld was a concern but felt that the most suitable
approach at Cumbernauld would be a designation as a conservation area by the local
authority combined with listing of important original elements by Historic Scotland. This
would ensure that there was pressure to deliver adequate maintenance and that any
new work was appropriate to the surroundings. A respondent thought that ‘…we must
have faith in the planning process and the vigilance of “watchdogs”, both local and
national, but their influence depended on popular support and as to that I am not
optimistic…’.

**Listing is not always welcomed**

Listing was in most cases seen as helpful, but not in every case. A respondent noted
the issue of the over bureaucratic nature of listing, while someone else was concerned
that when a site is listed you are not allowed to do anything to it and finds listing very
intrusive and restrictive. At Bannockburn some respondents were unhappy with the
listing because it meant that the modernist structures could not be demolished. The
fact that statutory listing applies only to built features was also not always appreciated
by respondents. One respondent found that listing sets problems and ‘…conserve as
found (or as now existing rather) should not be an option, contrary to normal policy…’.

At Stirling University not all interviewed students appear to appreciate that some
buildings have listed status while they believe that the landscaping in particular makes
the site so pleasing. Stirling University was also mentioned as an example of how
management of sites tends ‘…to resist the currently rigorous and inhibiting
consequences of listing…’. A respondent spoke about Portrack, where Charles Jencks,
the owner, is still developing the garden and appears to not wish for elements of the
site to be included in the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes in Scotland,
this even though the garden has already gained international significance. The
respondent agrees that the commitment of Charles Jencks and his family is sufficient in
the short term, but feels that this is ‘…no guarantee and in the longer term it is possible
that the site might decline or (in a more extreme case) be destroyed if some or all of
the land was sold or made available for development…’. For that reason he does feel
that some form of designation by Historic Scotland would be ‘…a valuable tool to
protect the significant elements of the design, ensure (and perhaps assist with)
appropriate management and require notification of significant land use change…’.

Another respondent agrees that some form of preparedness should be in place for the
long term, but feels that as it is a private and privately funded garden ‘…at present only
its significance should be noted, so that when or if it needs to be moved into a more public domain the ammunition is already in place...’. One respondent’s opinion about this is that designed landscapes should not be listed before they are thirty years old.

**Insufficient funding for listing work**

Some respondents raised the problem that institutions that are concerned with listing, such as Historic Scotland or English Heritage, are under funded. One respondent worried that they have a purpose to help conserve and protect but ‘...they have a huge task to look at every single building, modern as well as older, in order to determine whether they should be listed...’; not even mentioning landscapes. Examples of significant places that got demolished before Historic Scotland even managed to look at them were mentioned in responses. A respondent mentioned that at Suntrap the people who had just completed a survey of the main house, designed by Sir Robert Matthew, were puzzled why it had not yet been put up for listing. One respondent thought that maybe this was because it would restrict the owners and that they therefore maybe should keep silent.

**Need for changed attitudes**

While statutory protection may be seen as a way forward some respondents believed that often the problem was rather one of attitudes. A respondent worried that for example at Bannockburn the built features have now been listed, but is not certain that this will be sufficient to protect them. Another respondent believes that it was coincidence that the features got spot listed, but is not convinced yet of the National Trust for Scotland’s commitment to this and wonders ‘...if listing is not enough, then what? The Trust is here to safeguard. The Trust created something that is now A-listed. How many other things did the Trust create that are listed as such?...’. At Cumbernauld an interviewee also finds that there are sufficient means to protect the area, but attitudes have to change. She thinks that ‘...Cumbernauld would need to be viewed as a heritage site or at least as a conservation area. This is unlikely to happen in the foreseeable future but perceptions are likely to change through time...’. She added that we should not forget that the typical tenements in many Scottish cities were seen as slums at times, but not all were demolished and they are now valued as our traditional and valuable housing stock.
Politics surrounding sites
A number of respondents spoke about the politics surrounding sites and how this can damage conservation. In Cumbernauld a respondent spoke about ‘…the absolute hatred between the North Lanarkshire Council people in the headquarters in Motherwell and those in Cumbernauld…’. He believes that including Cumbernauld in this local council set-up was completely opportunistic. There are apparently strong political, social and religious contrasts, which do not help the situation. Another respondent spoke at Little Sparta about how Ian Hamilton Finlay was renowned for his hatred of institutions, and that for a long time he was basically ‘…at war…’ with them. This means many institutions are now less keen to support the garden, but also Ian Hamilton Finlay ‘…would have hated it…’ even if some would now support the site. A respondent mentioned that Bannockburn has serious political slants, and this has serious ramifications to what the National Trust for Scotland does at the site.

8.9 Concerns about social problems and vandalism
In the responses to the case study survey 5.33 per cent of the items mentioned related to social problems and vandalism. Particularly under the questions that asked for key problems, and matters relating to people, these issues came up frequently. In general the responses related to the problem of anti-social behaviour and the wish for more public involvement to help address these problems.

Vandalism and anti-social behaviour
Issues with vandalism and anti-social behaviour were raised by several respondents as the main concern under this heading. From the responses it was clear that this concern came up in particular at the urban case study sites and sites that had a Modernist design appearance. For example, at Cumbernauld respondents called the bushes and shrubs a potential paradise for junkies, gangs and perverts. Respondents remarked that because of the Council’s inadequate maintenance, locals were now renting some land around their houses from the Council to look after it and in so doing resolve the problem. Security issues and social problems such as alcohol abuse and drugs were raised as causing significant problems. One respondent thought that if drug use ‘…continues like this, there will be no tradesmen in a couple years…’, as these young people will not have had the proper education. Another problem mentioned in the responses was that there were no proper facilities for kids in Cumbernauld. Interviewed
residents of one neighbourhood complained that the swimming pool was shut three years ago for renovation, the ice skating rink was closed and the swing park is dangerously hidden in woods (Fig. 69). With nothing for kids to do, it is normal that anti-social behaviour occurs, said an interviewee. Another respondent added that she felt as if there were more dogs in the Seafar neighbourhood than kids, but the Council provides no dog bins, even though local residents started to ask for them two and a half years ago. A respondent also felt that residents were not helped by the police who did not confront the problems.

At Bannockburn problems of abuse include graffiti, dogs, vandalism and other anti-social behaviour were stated in the responses. An interviewee spoke about teenagers smashing bottles, trying to ricochet a football off the Brutalist rotunda while visitors are there, or climbing on the structures with obvious health and safety risks (Fig. 70). Another respondent feels that none of this is helped by the Modernist nature of the structures on the site. The question of many respondents was how they could tackle anti-social behaviour. A respondent was of the opinion that ‘...no matter how much money will be put into Bannockburn, it will again become dilapidated, unless the social issues are being resolved...’.

The impact of public involvement on social behaviour
Several responses mentioned the lack of interaction of planners and decision-takers with the local community, to make sure that they realise what is there, or to involve the community in the preparation of new proposals for a site. This concern was already mentioned under planning and development processes, but is also seen as being of highest importance in relation to resolving anti-social behaviour. Within this context respondents also pointed out that involvement of the community would give a sense of ownership, which is especially important with youths and children.
Fig. 69: The swing park near Seafar, Cumbernauld, near woods and a significant distance away from housing (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 70: Safety and vandalism remains a concern about the Rotunda at Bannockburn (Author’s photograph).
A respondent also raised that he believes that in some circumstances the wider public should organise themselves ‘…to get together and demand their rights…’ and refers to the issues in Cumbernauld with anti-social behaviour and the poor maintenance work by the Council. Responses by site staff also highlighted the problem of not being consulted by decisions-takers about the site or develop proposals. They felt that staff at properties were not given sufficient opportunities to be listened to.

**The influence of social issue on people’s opinions of landscapes of the recent past**

Respondents described that when people have little appreciation of post war designed landscapes it is at times because they associate it with urban landscaping and the associated social problems, the unsafe areas and vandalism. A respondent believed that in order to secure a lot of open green space for people, but at the same time avoid anti-social behaviour, many post war landscapes tend to feature a lot of open space, grass with trees only, and few focal points. While such design may have assisted in avoiding social problems, it may have influenced people’s opinions of such landscapes in a negative way.

**8.10 Concerns about marketing and commercialisation**

Only 1.73 per cent of the responses, the lowest response rate for a category of issue, related to concerns about marketing of the sites, commercialisation and the impact of increased access. While this indicates that it was not seen as the biggest concern on people’s minds, there were nevertheless a number of respondents concerns that need mentioning.

**Marketing difficulties**

In the responses problems with marketing that were mentioned included the need for more promotional material, such as at the Gibberd Garden where respondents wished for more publications on the garden as all would help to attract people to the site. At the same time responses raised the difficulty that marketing specialists had with sites of the recent past. For example at Bannockburn, a National Trust for Scotland property, respondents said that marketing people did not know how to promote the site using the recent Modernist features.
Improving merchandising and retail

Issues raised about merchandising in the case study survey highlighted that merchandising, catering, and retail at most sites still had a much higher potential. A respondent wished that retail products would relate more to the garden, such as the plants, or for example at Falkland Palace respondents wished for historic postcards of the garden shortly after the Percy Cane borders were created. In general merchandising concerns were not specifically unique to sites from the recent past.

Danger of commercially and business driven approaches

Overly commercial approaches to create income where mentioned by respondents as a risk. Thinking about Falkland Palace Garden, one respondent felt that the National Trust for Scotland ‘…is becoming more commercially driven, and less concerned with the conservation of a site. Without good conservation, there will be no site, therefore no visitors, no income and so on…’. A respondent wondered about similar concerns at Falkland Palace and questioned in terms of safeguarding the site, whether the site was therefore currently in the best pair of hands.

Another respondent also noted such concerns but within the context of major development projects at sites, such as at Bannockburn, where he felt that the nature of the commercial design enterprise, which prepared the new development proposals, appeared to have been ‘…to make as much profit as possible…’. The respondent saw lack of control by the client as a worry as they have to know that ‘…business-run organisations will misuse budgets to make their profit as high as possible. They will list or employ one person to win the competition, but next get the person who can do the cheapest job. That is what happens when they are in control of the budget…’.

8.11 Concerns about education, enjoyment, interpretation and access

The literature review in Chapter Two confirmed that various existing recommendations on the subject of the conservation of the recent past requested for training and educational initiatives. The analysis in Chapter Seven of initiatives by stakeholders concluded that there are still too few training and learning activities with a focus on designed landscapes of the recent past. The responses from the case study survey provide more data to validate these findings and cross-examine results.
The literature review also confirmed that recommendations asked for actions to enhance the involvement and participation of the wider public, but access and enjoyment of sites was not raised in recommendations as requiring special attention. The case study survey proved therefore most valuable in establishing a shortcoming in existing recommendations, as several issues were mentioned by respondents about access and enjoyment.

In total 9.29 per cent of the responses referred to issues about the access to sites, the needs for interpretation, education and visitor facilities. Key findings are summarised next.

8.11.1 Education and Interpretation

Frustrations were voiced at case study sites by respondents about the educational system and how it was difficult to provide educational experiences in gardens due to the current educational curriculum that is followed by schools. Some respondents complained about not having the necessary educational facilities to welcome school children but wished that they could run more educational programmes at their gardens. A general concern raised was that people appear not to recognise that through educational programmes for children at gardens, these children might become more interested in landscaping and gardening. Another respondent was disappointed with the lack of public education on the importance and relevance of landscape to our daily lives and well being, and is of the opinion that the lack of public respect for post-1945 landscape architecture is a result of a combination of the bad press and ignorance about the landscaping industry.

Interpretation was highlighted by several respondents as most important for the sites, but also for the appearance and understanding of features of the recent past. At Bannockburn some respondents’ concerns related to the appropriateness of the Modernist features, in particular the rotunda, as efficient interpretative tools. An interviewee recalled that she was at the official inauguration of the features in 1965 when the Queen visited and that there were interpretative panels on the inside of the rotunda. Over the years poor maintenance and the non-replacement of panels and signage contributed to a run down appearance. Another respondent agreed with this
and said that visitors now do not know why the rotunda is there or what interpretative purpose it has, and as a result the rotunda now ‘...makes no sense. It is now asking to be climbed on...’.

A respondent explained how the garden at Dunbar’s Close was created as a ‘...Seventeenth Century pastiche...’. For this reason plants that reflect that era are used, and not modern bedding. A problem with this is that visitors rarely know about this approach because there are no plant labels. The respondent admits though that this would nevertheless be difficult due to the risk of vandalism. As an alternative the staff hope to get at least a leaflet holder with information on the garden and plant lists in place. Respondents at Falkland Palace voiced similar opinions saying that the National Trust for Scotland must create more interesting interpretation to draw people in and tell the story of the place, including of the Percy Cane design. Workshops, outreach programmes, garden tours, courses and other pro-active initiatives should be created, said some respondents.

Some respondents acknowledged that at times problems exist with the original designs of landscapes of the recent past, and therefore proposed that interpretation is used more frequently as a tool to overcome such issues. The example of Falkland Palace was given, where ‘...possibly too much attention is given to the detail of Percy Cane’s design without regard to the ways plants behave. Perhaps a better way would be to interpret the design so as to create a similar effect as was desired by Cane. That would be more successful, and more interesting for the Head Gardener...’.

8.11.2 Enjoyment and access

A variety of concerns and issues were mentioned by respondents in relation to access and enjoyment.

The impact of increased access

Increased access to the case study sites was mentioned at just about every site as an area of concern. Staff interviewed at Falkland Palace spoke about wear and tear on paths and lawns due to increased access and events, and that while much of this is not that obvious, the gardeners notice the impact. For that reason they feel that they must be consulted when decisions are made that would result in additional wear and tear. At
Little Sparta, a fragile private garden with narrow paths, the issue of access was voiced as a major concern (Fig. 71). A respondent noticed that grass does not grow that well anymore on paths and turns into moss. Resurfacing these paths with gravel would alter the appearance of the place significantly.

Different opinions about access were voiced by respondents. For example, at Falkland Palace Garden a respondent thought that ‘...the garden was initially designed as a private garden, not for one with thousands of visitors each year, which can lead to wear and tear, increased numbers of benches, litter and so on...’; and another respondent does not believe that the various events that are hosted at the garden are necessarily good for the place. In contrast, someone responded saying that historically the garden had been used at times for entertainment, and ‘...in some ways the gardens were created as a place, as a backdrop for entertainment...as a place were the court could come away and where there would be music and archery...’. This respondent believes that saying that the impact of access is all modern life, ‘...is forgetting that this tension has always been here. It needs to be alive, a living place...’. He concludes that ‘...without any problems it would be a boring world...’ and that we need to live with these tensions.

A respondent that had visited Little Sparta, felt that the garden ‘...is best visited in small groups, or alone...’ and ‘...it is not suitable for young children, thus families are not always able to visit...’. Someone interviewed at the Gibberd Garden argued that it is also ‘...a domestic garden and ideally does not get masses of visitors...’. A response described that when the Gibberd Garden Trust organises special events such as a Snowdrop Day, often masses of people come and it ‘...feels overwhelming on that day...’. From the responses it is clear that striking the right balance between the number of visitors and the character of a garden is seen as a complex matter.

**Funding bodies and access requirements**

A respondent at Little Sparta acknowledged that the weather and the footsteps of visitors take a heavy toll on the grass and other paths in the garden, but accepts that ‘...public access is a prime requirement of many of the more important funding bodies in awarding grants...’. Responses from Trustees interviewed of the Little Sparta Trust indicate that they agree that in order to be awarded funding, the garden has to open its doors more. The Trustees believe that this is part of their duty, ‘...but over do it, have
too many people coming, and the garden will be over run. It is a very fragile thing and it cannot take too many people. We have to tread this difficult line between promoting the garden, and on the other hand insuring that it is protected...’ and this ‘...alongside the need to generate enough income for the garden to keep it to the standard it must be kept at...’. With this in mind a respondent called for the acceptance of alternative ways of delivering the access requirements of funding bodies. He argued that at Little Sparta ‘...we are saying that the site is so fragile that we got to reduce access, rather than expand it, or think about access in other ways. Other than experiencing the site itself...’. A respondent therefore also saw the need for visitor impact monitor programmes at fragile sites such as Little Sparta.

Access for the disabled
Responses also raised concerns about access for the disabled, which now also features high on the agendas of funding bodies. At Little Sparta, an interviewee argued that the garden was never built for that purpose and that it will never be accessible to wheelchairs or safe for disabled persons. He hopes that now that Little Sparta is recognised as ‘...a gem of Scottish cultural treasury...’ that funding bodies ‘...might accept that the physical audience has got to be limited, and that even disabled visitors might have limited access to it...’. At the Gibberd Garden an interviewee mentioned how someone of the family was also wheelchair bound, but was able to access the garden. This showed how accessible the garden is, which should be kept in mind before making alterations to the garden to suit access legislation.

Health and safety implications of access
A respondent was worried that at Portrack ‘...the exciting landforms and extensive water features raise health and safety issues if public access is allowed...’, but hopes that this can be addressed by informed disclaimers with the public assuming responsibility for themselves. At Little Sparta health and safety was mentioned by respondents as a potential problem, again due to the numerous water features. Concerns were that adaptations may have to be made to such features to facilitate public access. A respondent is of the opinion that it is not possible to change Little Sparta to make it fully safe and would be very concerned if people will attempt to do so. He says that Little Sparta ‘...is a wilderness and kind of discovery when you walk here. There are no handrails and you should not expect so. It is slippery and tricky...There is some risk, you are going on a little adventure...’.
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Fig. 71: Narrow paths at Little Sparta (Author’s photograph).

Fig. 72: Access arrangements and the annual opening period at Little Sparta (Author’s photograph).
Annual opening period
Respondents also raised the problem of the opening period of gardens. Respondents believe that this must be taken more into consideration at delicate gardens such as Little Sparta (Fig. 72). A interviewee said that one year the garden opened too early, already in late Spring, and the grass was still too weak and damage was caused. The following year the garden was opened a couple weeks later to allow the grass to mature more. This issue was described by a respondent as relating to the problem with opening the garden as long as possible in order to maximise income. While there is a drive for income generation, ‘...at the same time you do not want to risk what people come to experience…’.

Impacts of children and dogs
Some respondents mentioned concerns about dogs and children entering some case study sites. In a response it was pointed out that at the gate at Little Sparta there is a sign saying that children and animals are not allowed to enter the garden (Fig. 72). A respondent described this as ‘...quite ferocious. It seems so tyrannical, exclusive, but it is such a vulnerable garden...’. The respondent agrees that this is also about other visitors’ experiences and that when children are running around in a garden, this alters the atmosphere drastically. He felt that it results in ‘...hearing children as opposed to the sound of the wind through the leaves, birds, just the environmental sounds...’. Some respondents hope to enjoy the tranquillity in gardens, rather than the noise of ‘...a kids playground or dogs barking...’. Other respondents made similar comments about dogs and someone gave the example that dogs are problematic at Little Sparta because of the ducks.

Proper visitor facilities
Respondents commented on the absence of visitor facilities at some of the case study sites. For example, concerns were voiced with the number of seats at Bannockburn and the closure of the coffee shop. Someone else complained that there is not really anything at Bannockburn to stay there for long, while another respondent called the poor state of facilities at Bannockburn a wasted opportunity.

Access and anti-social behaviour
Anti-social behaviour was already mentioned under social issues but it also closely relates to access. Several respondents voiced their concerns over how unlimited free
public access can contribute to anti-social behaviour, especially in the evenings. A respondent at Bannockburn however believes that restricted access and the fencing of the Bannockburn site would be ‘...very expensive and detrimental to everybody...’. Concerns of respondents highlighted that while they often prefer to retain open access at sites, they are frustrated that this makes it at times difficult to do almost anything, as immediately something will get damaged.

8.12 Conclusions

The analysis of the survey responses resulted in a list of issues and concerns that were summarised under the ten heading of Table 4.8. An observation is that there is a degree of overlap between these headings, but in general the headings were useful in grouping the key findings. These findings of the case study survey can now be compared with the key conclusions and headings of recommendations, as summed up in the previous chapters. This comparison and cross-examination is illustrated in Table 8.1 in Appendix 6.

When comparing the main findings of the case study survey, in Table 8.1, it becomes evident that several categories of issues that were raised in the survey relate to areas of existing recommendations and actions, as highlighted in previous chapters. On the other hand, it becomes also clear that some of the concerns mentioned in the case study survey appear not to be covered in the existing headings of recommended actions. Similarly the responses in the case study survey did not refer to all areas of the existing recommendations, or did not raise concern in relation to some issues that were mentioned in the previous chapters. This comparison proves most valuable as it allows the research to identify gaps in existing recommendations and initiatives, and to prepare a more comprehensive list of areas of recommendations, which is a key objective of the research. The main findings of this cross-examination will be presented next.

Awareness and recognition

Table 8.1 illustrates that the subject of awareness and recognition has come up consistently in the findings of the previous chapters and the case study survey, and confirms that people’s opinions and the lack of recognition remain an underlying threat to landscapes of the recent past. The survey provided more insight into the opinions of
people about recent past landscapes, a subject area which would still benefit from further research. An important conclusion was nevertheless that not everyone has an opinion and where opinions are shared for designed landscapes of the recent past, not all of such opinions are low. Finally, opinions change and evolve over time.

**Concerns about management and maintenance**

The comparison of findings in Table 8.1 makes clear that concerns over the maintenance and management of sites have been raised in several recommendations on the subject and the survey also validated the findings of Chapter Five, on the continuing destruction of sites. The survey also provided the required data in relation to the work done by stakeholders that are involved in the day to day management of sites, for which limited documentation was available in existing literature sources. A key finding is that further research is needed to improve the understanding of the problems with the management and maintenance of designed landscapes of the recent past.

**Concerns about finance and budgets**

The cross-examination shows that matters relating to funding have been mentioned in existing recommendations and also were raised by respondents in the case study surveys. Of importance is however that the survey allowed significant concerns to be voiced, which in previous chapters had not been highlighted. Amongst these concerns are the shortage of funding for equipment, material and plants, and staffing. On-site staff wish for endowment funds and a change of attitude by funding bodies. The difficulty to tap into major public funding and risks associated with exclusive private sector funding for commercialisation were raised, as was the apparent waste of funds and business-run misuse of budgets.

**Challenges associated with materials and design**

*Materials*

The analysis in Table 8.1 confirms that the understanding of technological and material challenges was already highlighted in existing recommendations and in the analysis of the previous chapters. The fact that more research is still required on the subject of materials for landscaping purposes was also confirmed through the case studies.
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**Design**
The survey did however also point out a number of gaps in recommendations and initiatives under this subject. Most importantly existing recommendations have paid less attention to the issues relating to the design of sites. The use in design of poor materials, experimental approaches, narrow range of plants, together with academic unrealistic and unpractical designs, now cause practical challenges that need further investigation.

**Planting**
The survey also provided new data in relation to the challenges that people face regarding planting concepts, plants used and their maintenance. It is concluded that both design and planting are areas of concern that must be highlighted in recommended areas of actions for the conservation of landscapes of the recent past.

**Shortcomings in conservation planning and development processes**

*Conservation planning*
The analysis in Table 8.1 shows that the survey, analysis and evaluation of sites received proper attention in existing recommendations and initiatives by stakeholders, as analysed in Chapter Seven.

*Development*
A key finding is that the subject of development in landscapes was highlighted by many respondents as a main area of concern. The inappropriate disfigurement of sites was pointed out in the analysis of Chapter Five as a concern, but clearly the issue should receive more attention in recommended actions to improve the conservation of sites.

*Drivers behind the decisions*
Similarly drivers behind the decisions in conservation processes can be further researched as major concerns were mentioned about the politics behind sites, the use of design competitions, and the ignorance over subtle approaches compared to a favouring of non-sensitive big impact schemes.

*Monitoring and recording*
Finally, an observation is that respondents did not highlight monitoring and recording in the surveys.
Challenges with consulting and involving people

Consultation and participation
In the study consultation and participation have consistently been pointed out as of essential importance to the conservation of sites. Nevertheless the responses in the survey showed that planning processes still frequently fall short in regard of holistic interdisciplinary approaches and consultation. Staff at sites desire a greater involvement and original designers are rarely consulted. A concern that was noted was that respondents forgot to mention educational institutions and archives as being important stakeholders that should be consulted and involved in the conservation process.

Cooperation and partnerships
While cooperation has been highlighted in many recommendations, this came up as a gap in the responses of the case study surveys. This indicates that there is still a significant need for action to improve partnership and cooperation at a wider level, and site-specific level.

Concerns about social problems and vandalism
The case study survey was most valuable in pointing out that while matters relating to social problems have not been highlighted in existing recommendations, this is seen as an important area for concern by the wider public and people involved in the day to day management of sites. Respondents saw an important need for addressing social problems, vandalism and security issues, for the well being of the community and the site. Communities have an important role to play in this process.

Concerns about legal protection and politics
The lack of proper supportive legal protection and legislation was mentioned throughout the study and respondents also raised various concerns. The overview in Table 8.1 shows a degree of consistency in concerns between the findings of the different chapters. Key observations are that there is limited statutory protection for these landscapes and approaches differ between countries, and even within the United Kingdom. The inventories of landscapes of the recent past are still seriously lagging behind, when compared with buildings. Respondents also said that listing is not always helpful and that politics surrounding sites cause conflicts.
Concerns about marketing and commercialisation
The case study survey identified several concerns in relation to the marketing and promotion of sites, and their commercial use. The promotion of sites does get some mention in existing recommendations, but mainly in relation to improving awareness. The case study survey also gathered better opinions on the subject of marketing from the perspective of people involved at sites. A key lesson learned from these responses is that while sites and marketing specialists appear to struggle to promote designed landscapes from the recent past, respondents see significant concerns regarding increased visitor numbers, commercial activities and events at certain sites, and the risks of damage through popularity.

Concerns about education, enjoyment, interpretation and access
Training, education and interpretation
The comparison in Table 8.1 illustrates that the subject of education and training was mentioned in several existing recommendations. The case study survey confirmed that further efforts are required to improve achievements within this area, in particular the need for specialised skills and understanding of the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past. The current skills crisis in horticulture makes the need for action urgent.

Enjoyment and access
Given the fact that the case study surveys studied the issues from the perspective of the wider public, visitors and people involved in the day to day management of sites, responses identified another shortcoming in available recommendations and data, namely the challenges with education and access to sites. The importance of education and access is recognised but opening hours, events to generate income, general wear and tear, access for dogs, groups and children, the impact of facilitating better access, health and safety regulations, were all viewed as conflicts.

Other areas of recommended actions
Table 8.1 shows that a number of other existing recommendations and issues of concern were highlighted in previous chapters, and did not come up specifically in the responses of the case study survey. This is due to the fact that these issues relate to the wider context or are general conclusions. Of the concerns and issues that were not
covered in the survey but nevertheless remain, the most important areas of recommended actions are:

- The development of national strategies
- Improving the understanding of the wider context and full diversity of landscape architecture of the recent past
- Use of established methods and principles
- The preparation of overviews of initiatives and of who is doing what
- Stakeholders must in general pay more attention to landscapes of the recent past

A general conclusion is that the case study survey provided a significant amount of new data to understand how efficient current measures for the protection and conservation of designed landscapes are. At the same time gaps and shortcomings could be identified, resulting now in a more comprehensive overview of needed actions.

A conclusion is that many of the problems that were raised are not new to conservation and in general exist for conservation of sites from any age. It is clear that if existing conservation processes and methodologies are properly followed and respected that many of the issues would not arise. On the other hand, several problems are specific to designed landscapes from the recent past and their conservation. After this cross-examination of findings final conclusions can now be reached in the next chapter.
9 FINAL CONCLUSIONS

9.1 Key findings and recommendations

This study on identifying key problems regarding the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past is timely, particularly given that the Council of Europe’s Landscape Convention has been in place for almost ten years, the ongoing destruction and disfigurement of significant landscapes from this era, and the scattered understanding about the present situation and the key concerns. The study has revealed that general conservation principles and methodologies exist for the conservation of designed landscapes, but that a lack of recognition and awareness for the significance of the designed landscapes of the recent past results in poor implementation of such principles. The study therefore aimed to inform and recommend actions towards the improvement of the conservation of these landscapes.

Chapter One advanced the argument that designed landscapes of the recent past appear to have gained recognition in recent years, but that nevertheless in the United Kingdom many sites appear threatened, including sites that have been listed on national inventories of significant sites.

The literature review in Chapter Two critically reviewed current knowledge and concluded that several recommendations for actions to improve the conservation and protection of heritage of the recent past exist. A gradual change of attitude towards heritage of the recent past was observed since the 1980s, culminating around 1995 in initial initiatives in the United Kingdom to protect landscapes of the recent past. While steady progress was made regarding protection and conservation of buildings of the recent past, and the associated technological challenges, only sporadic initiatives on the subject of landscapes were observed in the United Kingdom up to 2000. In the United States more activities were launched, with the Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture conferences (Birnbaum, 1999b; Birnbaum et al., 2004) leading the way. In the United Kingdom it was hoped that under the impulse of the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000) firmer measures for the protection of landscapes
of the recent past would be developed, but the momentum instead appeared to stagnate. Nevertheless, from a comparison of existing recommendations it is concluded that many people and organisations have highlighted similar suggestions for needed actions to improve the conservation of these landscapes. A study to analyse the present state and progress with the implementation of such recommendations is therefore timely.

Chapter Three focused on defining the scope and context of the research by providing a typology for designed landscapes of the recent past and clarifying conservation and the conservation process. Most importantly, to enable the review of the present state of protection and implementation, in Chapter Three an overview of the main categories of stakeholders, or organisations and people that are involved in the conservation process of designed landscapes, was prepared. It was concluded that stakeholders could be grouped into seven main categories.

With the research objectives and the scope of the study established, in Chapter Four the chosen triangulation research methodology was explained. Through additional literature review and an investigation of inventories and stakeholder initiatives the wider context or ‘the general’ was studied in detail. The emphasis of the research was on the United Kingdom but relevant findings and actions from an international context were included. The examination of the site-specific context or ‘the particular’ required a case study survey approach with a focus on qualitative data. Structured questionnaires and interviews were employed as method of data collection. The data and findings from the additional research and case study survey allowed a validation and cross-examination of the findings of the literature review in Chapter Two, and a verification of the present problems and status of implementation of existing recommendations.

Chapter Five dealt with validating through a study of literature the continuing destruction and disfigurement of significant sites. From this analysis it was concluded that while policy frameworks and conservation philosophies are in place to facilitate the protection of significant heritage, nevertheless serious damage occurs to these sites. The impacts and threats could be grouped into three main categories of damage, namely physical neglect and poor maintenance of sites, disfigurement of sites and the loss or destruction of sites. The analysis confirmed that this research is timely and that improvement to the current methods and frameworks for protection are needed.
While Chapter Five studied impacts at sites, in Chapter Six a study was undertaken of the number of sites that actually are included in key inventories and registers, given the fact that these are often seen as one of the main measures for protection. While a good number of inventories exist, a most important finding was that only a small number of designed landscapes of the recent past have been included on national inventories of significant sites in the United Kingdom. Registers kept by non-governmental organisations with a merit on the recent past, largely overlook landscapes, and when landscapes of the recent past are included in registers this is no guarantee for their protection. Governmental and non-governmental organisations must make more effort to implement the existing recommendations about documenting and listing sites and not just pay lip-service to them. The protection of significant designed landscapes deserves as much attention as buildings. Progress in the United States is also not ideal but nevertheless better than in the United Kingdom and lessons can be learned from their approaches.

Chapter Seven examined in detail the role and work by key stakeholders at an international and national level. The analysis provided an overview of progress achieved by key stakeholders that act at an international and national level. The key measures of the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000) provided a framework against which progress with the implementation of measures by stakeholders acting at a national level could be evaluated. In general many initiatives that relate to the conservation of the recent past were observed, but landscape initiatives were lagging behind. Legal protection, listing, funding and national strategies for the conservation of these sites remain inadequate. Organisations should put more emphasis on landscapes and through cooperation, partnerships and the study of international examples, improvements can be achieved in the United Kingdom. Efforts must be made to increase the recognition of these landscapes and to enhance an understanding of the wider context of the subject and the technical and material challenges. A shortcoming in the findings was that after this analysis a gap remained about an understanding of the work done by stakeholders involved in the day to day management of sites and visitors and the wider public. However, this shortcoming was overcome by the use of the case study survey which involved eleven sites of various types of designed landscapes of the recent past.
The empirical analysis of data collected in the case study survey was presented in Chapter Eight. The data was analysed and resulted in key issues that could be grouped under ten main headings. A comparison and cross-comparison of the survey findings with the key conclusions and headings of recommendations, as summed up in the previous chapters, could take place. In doing so gaps in implementation and existing approaches could be identified and main recommendations could be prepared in Chapter Nine. While there is always a degree of overlap between different recommendations, three headings have been used to group main recommended measures:

- Recommendations for the wider context
- Recommendations for the site-specific context
- Recommendations relating to stakeholders

These three headings make it clear that key measures for action should aim to address the problems regarding the conservation of designed landscapes at various levels.

9.1.1 Recommendations for the wider context

- **Progress was made, but much ongoing efforts are required**
  From the research it is clear that many actions have already been undertaken to address existing recommendations. Nevertheless ongoing action is needed as many concerns and shortcomings continue to exist, with significant landscapes of the recent past still being damaged or lost.

- **Landscapes require more attention**
  Efforts must be made to give landscapes of the recent past more attention. Many stakeholders and organisations take initiatives forward, but too few focus on landscapes of the recent past.

- **Prepare accessible data and overviews of existing initiatives**
- **Improve awareness and recognition of designed landscapes of the recent past**
  Landscape professionals and other stakeholders should develop actions to raise awareness and improve recognition among persons in positions of responsibility and the wider public. In particular owners and stewards must be educated. Similarly, a better understanding about people's opinions of landscapes of the recent past, and of the impact of lack of awareness on sites should be developed.
• **Use the current and established standards, methods and principles of conservation**

Existing conservation methodologies are suitable for sites of all periods, including landscapes of the recent past. Stakeholders and professionals must follow existing methodologies and principles in the conservation process.

• **The preparation of an international charter or guideline on the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past**

None of the existing guidelines or recommendations cover comprehensively the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past. This leads to the conclusion that an international charter, guideline or manifesto on the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past would be of use and timely. Key organisations such as DOCOMOMO, ICOMOS and IFLA would be best placed to take a lead on this.

• **Formulate national strategies**

Governmental organisations and key non-governmental bodies, conservation organisations and professional landscape architecture membership organisations should formulate a national strategy for the United Kingdom to safeguard the legacy of designed landscapes of the recent past.

• **Develop recommendations that are more site specific and of local relevance**

The existing recommendations mostly deal with the overarching context of policy, recognition, protection, research and planning, and more attention should be paid to establishing clear recommendations for action that address site-specific concerns.

• **Improve the efficiency of legal protection and registration of landscapes of the recent past**

There needs to be better statutory protection and control for significant sites of the recent past, with grants made available more easily for the conservation of sites. Actions towards documenting and registering must improve to include more landscapes of the recent past, as landscapes lag behind compared to achievements for buildings. Consistency in approaches and level of action across the United Kingdom needs to be achieved. Stakeholder organisations can make significant contributions towards inventories, and existing inventory work should be promoted and made accessible to the wider public.

• **Improving the understanding of the wider context and full diversity of landscape architecture of the recent past**
Explore and develop the knowledge of landscapes of the recent past and the full diversity of issues with more studies on the conservation and technological challenges. Establish a larger context for contemporary landscape architecture and the history and aesthetics of landscapes of the recent past.

- **Improve the understanding of technological and material challenges, including that on planting and soft landscaping materials.**
  
  Address the gap that exists on documentation and studies about the subject of specific landscape design materials, conservation practice and conservation methodologies for landscapes of the recent past. In particular develop a similar understanding for planting and soft landscaping materials.

### 9.1.2 Recommendations for the site-specific context

- **Progress systematic identification, survey, evaluation and planning**
  
  Develop programmes to systematically progress the identification, recording, documentation, investigation, assessment and evaluation of sites. Document threatened sites. Support the development of conservation planning and management documentation for the conservation and protection of sites which would guide future decisions.

- **Improve the management and maintenance of sites**
  
  Progress has been made, but more efforts are required to improve management and maintenance programmes of sites to avoid physical neglect and poor maintenance of sites, and destruction and disfigurement of significant landscapes. The impacts of impractical design and poor understanding of design concepts on maintenance must be addressed. Management should take into account environmental friendly approaches and climate change.

- **Resolve challenges associated with impractical and experimental designs**

  Recognise the value of designs of the landscapes of the recent past and look creatively for solutions to overcome challenges of impractical and experimental designs and planting schemes in significant landscapes.

- **Avoid inappropriate disfigurements of sites and developments**

  Use existing conservation planning and management documentation and processes to avoid inappropriate changes to sites.

- **Improve monitoring and record keeping, and ensure proper archives**
Integrate monitoring in the conservation process and retain accessible archives and records for site-specific documentation, landscape architects’ archives and general records on the subject of landscapes of the recent past.

- **Address finance and budgets, and the use of funds**
  Establish proper funding for equipment, material and plants, and staffing. Work towards endowment funds for sites and address apparent waste of funds and business-run misuse of budgets. Promote a change of attitude by funding bodies towards recent past heritage and landscapes. Authorities should establish governmental grants. Avoid risks associated with exclusive private sector funding for commercialisation.

- **Increase promotion and marketing of landscapes of the recent past**
  Increase the promotion and marketing of landscapes of the recent past but in the meantime avoid damage through intense use and popularity at sites.

- **Recognise and manage impacts of access and enjoyment of sites**
  The impact of increasing access and various types of access must be recognized and managed. Limitations on access should be allowed by funding bodies to safeguard values and integrity of sites.

### 9.1.3 Recommendations relating to stakeholders

- **Integrate consultation and participation in all aspects of the conservation process**
  Assure an informed public discourse that involves all stakeholder categories, and consult original designers when possible. Encourage participation to enhance ‘ownership’.

- **Increase training, education and interpretation opportunities**
  More training opportunities that focus on the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past should be organised to address the skills shortage at sites, other events and institutes. Educational facilities should be provided where possible at sites to encourage learning initiatives. The importance and relevance of landscape to our daily lives and well-being should be incorporated more in the educational curriculum.

- **Improve conservation practice through cooperation and partnerships**
  Improve conservation practice, policies and awareness through cooperation and partnerships and the exchange of knowledge and experiences. Forge partnerships...
between professionals, owners, key stakeholder organisations, nationally and internationally. Enhance knowledge and approaches through cooperation between the landscape architecture, buildings, and conservation disciplines.

- **Tackle the problems associated with anti-social behaviour at sites**
- **Compile accessible overviews of who is doing what, and who should be doing what, with suggestions of actions for specific disciplinary categories**
- **Establish expert committees on the subject within existing organisations, such as professional landscape architecture membership organisations**
  Establish expert committees within existing organisations, to promote the value of these sites, enhance and share knowledge and experience, and make landscape architects more aware of the importance of features of the recent past.
- **Set up a specialist organisation to promote stewardship and conservation of landscapes, including designed landscapes of the recent past**
  Use examples from abroad to establish a new organisation for this purpose, or to integrate such missions in existing landscape organisations.

### 9.2 Further research

The study summed up many areas of concerns but nevertheless it is clear that other problems and concern may exist. However, it is believed that problems which are identified in the future will in most cases relate to the main headings and themes of the final recommendations.

The study’s main focus was on the United Kingdom with particular attention to the case study sites. In the process of the research the investigator visited many designed landscapes from the recent past across the world and observed many similar recurring problems. Though the research will not be fully representative for the situations across the world, many international recommendations on the conservation of heritage of the recent past were consulted and taken into account.

Several areas for further research were highlighted in the key recommendations. It is clear that many initiatives exist and that cooperation, partnerships and the exchange of experiences can assist to improve practice. It is hoped that the study has made a useful contribution to a better understanding of the pertinent problems. This can enable existing or new organisations to develop targeted initiatives. Similarly, it is hoped that
the prepared documentation can inform conservation of sites and actions to improve approaches.

It is important to recognise that initiatives already continue to be developed by governmental and non-governmental stakeholders and that new events will continue to influence the findings and recommendations of this study. Further research can therefore make a contribution towards keeping available documentation and data up to date. In general progress remains at present slow within this subject field, but even since the submission of the thesis some events occurred in relation to the studied resources and sites that illustrate how things continuously evolve. In particular some recent developments that relate to key organisations, including ICOMOS and DOCOMOMO, and some of the studied sites are noteworthy. Some developments are much welcomed, while sadly also new setbacks continue to occur.

A first recent development that must be mentioned here relates to the findings of Chapter Six and the status of registers and inventories. The importance of the Heritage Protection Review in England to address the discrepancies in statutory protection and control was raised in Chapter Six. Key organisations such as ICOMOS United Kingdom (2007) indicated that they welcomed changes to the system. Disappointingly, an important setback occurred when the Government decided to halt the Heritage Protection Bill due to the predicted costs for the implementation of the Bill and the decision by the Government towards the end of 2008 to prioritise legislation to tackle the impact of the credit crunch (Henley, 2008). This has been a major blow to the needed reform of the current outdated system.

Another development that relates to inventory work concerns the Parks and Gardens UK Database project. Chapter Six described how the Database project received £1 million funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund to enhance the original Database. By 2009 the Database was re-launched and listed over 120 sites post war sites (Parks and Gardens UK, 2008b). The Heritage Lottery funded project now ended and frustratingly the Database finds itself now again in a position without resources for staffing budgets. Without proper continuity the data will become outdated and the Database may never reach its full potential, for example as an education resource. Clearly the way conservation projects are at present funded in the United Kingdom
must be evaluated, as it is incomprehensible that major funding occurs for a few years but that hardly any no support appears available for long-term running costs.

Positive news also came from the World Monuments Fund who included in their List of Endangered Sites for 2010 two sites that are located in Caracas, Venezuela, and that contain significant landscaping elements of the recent past (World Monuments Fund, 2010). The listing of La Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, Universidad Central de Venezuela, highlights mainly the risks to the architecture. This campus was constructed in 1957 and designed by Carlos Raul Villanueva following the principles of the Bauhaus, and was designated a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 2000. More important is even the listing of the Parque del Este, which was completed in 1961 after a design by the Brazilian landscape architect Robert Burle Marx. It is the first time a post-1945 park has been included on the List of Endangered Sites. While it remains disappointing that there is heritage at risk, the fact that these two sites made it to the List of Endangered Sites should be interpreted as a positive step forward as this indicates an increasing recognition of landscapes of the recent past. It is hoped that this will raise awareness amongst other key organisations and help to stimulate them to undertake proper actions.

Since 2008 English Heritage published a Heritage at Risk Register and noteworthy is that in 2009 the first parks and gardens were included in the second edition of the Register. By April 2010 the Register included 96 parks and gardens, of which only one post war period site, the landscaping at the Commonwealth Institute in London by Dame Sylvia Crowe (English Heritage, 2010). The landscaping at the Commonwealth Institute is deteriorating due to poor maintenance and the proposals for the redevelopment of the building and site may even result in the total destruction of the design by Dame Sylvia Crowe (Bayley, 2010). That only one site of the recent past features on the Register is due to the fact that only sites that feature on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens are added to the Heritage at Risk Register. Similar initiatives would be welcome in the United Kingdom for non-registered sites. For instance, the Cultural Landscape Foundation (2010) continues to post in the United States saved, at risk and lost sites on its website. Sadly several significant landscapes of the recent past continue to be demolished and lost. For instance, Lawrence Halprin’s sculpture garden at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond, Virginia, has now been demolished to make place for the planned extensions (Birnbaum, 2010).
At an international level it must be noted that the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage (2010) has now established a Heritage Alert project. While this can be seen as a step forward, it still appears that the Committee continues to predominantly focus on buildings of the recent past and continues to overlook landscapes. The DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscapes (Personal communication, May 22, 2010) announced that it is keen to use the findings and recommendations of this research to develop a position paper on landscapes and a DOCOMOMO plan of action. In doing so, the Specialist Committee hopes to encourage the DOCOMOMO National Working Parties to undertake landscape initiatives within their countries, such as recording a number of sites, and stimulate other stakeholders to establish actions. Another positive development can also be seen at the Cultural Landscape Foundation, who are highlighting online occasionally the design features and materials of landscapes of the recent past (Brandt and Meyer, 2008). As mentioned in the conclusions, more initiatives are needed to enhance our understanding of the technological issues.

Since the submission of the thesis developments interesting developments could be observed in relation to some other sites that were mentioned in the research. The successful campaign by the National Trust for Historic Preservation (2010) and Landmarks Illinois to fundraise $7.5 million for the purchase of the Farnsworth House in Plano, Illinois, has resulted in averting the dismantling of the house and its move to another location. In April 2010 the Trust opened the house for a first time as one of its historic sites that can be visited by the wider public (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2010). In Scotland the removal of the Rotunda and associated landscaping at the Bannockburn Heritage Site by the National Trust for Scotland had already been halted by 2004 when the proposals for a new visitor centre were axed. A positive development is that finally in 2009 a new project was launched to develop new proposals to upgrade the existing facilities, interpretation and landscape. The National Trust for Scotland and Historic Scotland set out to do so in partnership and with a completion date of 2014, when the 700th Anniversary of the battle will be commemorated (Historic Scotland, 2010). At Little Sparta the Trustees are at present also aiming to launch a project to prepare a comprehensive conservation management plan for the garden. For this project they hope to receive match funding by Historic Scotland (Personal communication, December 12, 2009).
Clearly some positive progress can be noted towards the way these landscapes are conserved and protected. However, there remains an urgent need to increase actions, and most importantly, to start acting as soon as possible.

9.3 The need to act now

Longstreth already warned in 1991 that ‘...if we continue to disregard so much that is all around us, we may waste far more than preserve and bestow upon future generations the difficult task of deciphering the carcass....’ (Longstreth, 1991). In 1995 at the first conference on Preserving the Recent Past, Ward Jandl said it was ‘...not a moment too soon...’ (Jandl, 1995) to undertake action. He explains how at that time still few scholarly works on the subject were available and that we no longer had the luxury of time to stand back, as the threat to recent heritage was all around us (Jandl, 1995).

Birnbaum believes that ‘...we must be committed to these landscapes that are often a part of our everyday lives, even those that we take for granted. If we allow these losses and modifications to continue – unmonitored by the profession and allied communities – we run the risk of erasing a significant chapter of landscape history....’ (Birnbaum, 1999a). The importance of the recent past cannot be overlooked. Bertrand Goldberg explained that ‘...we will find in our recent past all the discoveries we need, both technological and sociological, to forge a successful urbanism....’ (Goldberg, 1995) and that the recent past has made an enormous contribution towards our ability to build whatever we think. In the recent past there has been an unprecedented rate of political and scientific change (Goldberg, 1995). If we now desire something for the Twenty-First Century, we have the resources and knowledge to do it. Therefore Goldberg believes that to conserve our recent past is to conserve our future (Goldberg, 1995).

The findings of this study confirm, as did Birnbaum (1999a) already said in 1999, that progress was made, but that many more ongoing efforts are required with much work remaining to be done. Concerns raised in this research can be developed into actions and recommendations under the above headings to prevent a downward spiral of this valuable heritage. It is hoped that the research has made it clear that it is time to act
now or in other words, that it is not a moment too soon to implement these recommendations.
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APPENDIX 1

Table 2.1: A comparison of recommendations for the conservation of heritage and designed landscapes of the recent past
Table 2.1: A comparison of recommendations for the conservation of heritage and designed landscapes of the recent past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Survey, analysis and evaluation of sites</td>
<td>Identify and promote the recording of works</td>
<td>Identification of the twentieth-century heritage/Making systematic inventories</td>
<td>Identifying the recent past/Recording the recent past</td>
<td>Identification/Inventorisation/Systematic Documentation</td>
<td>Document threatened work</td>
<td>Identification of significant structures/Documentation and evaluation</td>
<td>Identification and Assessment</td>
<td>Survey of illustrative cases</td>
<td>Develop stewardship ethos for documentation</td>
<td>Systematic historical and architectural investigations/ Survey and assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Legal protection and listing</td>
<td>Landmarking (nominations to registers)</td>
<td>Registers</td>
<td>Protection of the most significant heritage items/Practical measures for legal protection</td>
<td>Choices have to be made in regard of selection.</td>
<td>Pursue nominations</td>
<td>Protection/Legislation/Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Management and maintenance programmes of sites</td>
<td>Promote preservation programmes</td>
<td>Oppose destruction and disfigurement of significant works of the modern movement</td>
<td>Management and conservation of the heritage/Use of the heritage/Physical conservation</td>
<td>Conservation treatments, instead of removal</td>
<td>Preserving the recent past</td>
<td>Encourage restoration work, with respect to aesthetic qualities</td>
<td>Landscape quality objectives</td>
<td>Ongoing preservation and management/Develop stewardship ethos for treatment and</td>
<td>Safeguard, protect and prevent from damage/Investigations on a specific character of adaptive reuse/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Promotion, raising awareness and communication</td>
<td>Encourage articles, books, and lectures</td>
<td>Bring the significance of the modern movement to the attention of the public, the authorities, the professions and the educational community concerned with the built environment/ Disseminate this knowledge throughout the professions</td>
<td>Promotion of awareness among persons in positions of responsibility and among the public/ Use of all available forms of media for campaigns of publicity</td>
<td>Share results with colleagues through publications, meetings, conferences, and newer on-line technologies</td>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>Publication of results and preparation of specialized bibliographies/ importance of media in raising awareness.</td>
<td>Educate owners and public stewards</td>
<td>Awareness-raising</td>
<td>Promote</td>
<td>Publications/ public awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Understanding technological and material challenges</td>
<td>Foster the development of appropriate techniques and methods of conservation/ Disseminate knowledge throughout the professions</td>
<td>Knowledge materials/Knowledge about how to maintain and conserve them</td>
<td>Technical challenge</td>
<td>New technologies as well as traditional materials and structural forms /Research programmes on specific problems concerning techniques and</td>
<td>Understanding technology/Development of methods for their repair and conservation</td>
<td>Identification and Assessment</td>
<td>Develop stewardship ethos for treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Understanding the wider context of landscape architecture of the recent past</td>
<td>Explore and develop the knowledge of the modern movement</td>
<td>Promoting knowledge and study of the heritage</td>
<td>Knowledge/understanding and appreciation of the significance</td>
<td>The beginnings of the recent past (&quot;not old enough&quot;)</td>
<td>Attention is required to all types/full spectrum/Research programmes</td>
<td>Establish a larger context for contemporary landscape architecture</td>
<td>Understanding of their aesthetics</td>
<td>Identification and Assessment/Full diversity Twentieth Century</td>
<td>Understand full diversity of issues</td>
<td>Instructive work on the meaning and cultural significance of the Twentieth Century heritage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Use of established methods and principles</td>
<td>Use established principles of conservation</td>
<td>Utilize current standards and guidelines</td>
<td>Cooperation and joint policies</td>
<td>Insisting on strict application of internationally approved scientific principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Cooperation and partnerships</td>
<td>European cooperation: regular exchange/Mutual technical assistance/Coordination of effort/generate awareness/Multilateral conservation projects</td>
<td>Forging partnerships between preservation professionals and the building owners</td>
<td>Partnerships are essential</td>
<td>Establish creative partnerships</td>
<td>Cooperation and joint policies</td>
<td>Cooperate</td>
<td>work out a programme of international cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Development of</td>
<td>The need for further action</td>
<td>Formulate a national</td>
<td>Cooperation and joint</td>
<td>Develop national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National strategies</td>
<td>J. Monitor and record keeping</td>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>Ensure proper homes for archives</td>
<td>Identification and assessment</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Policies/Implementation</td>
<td>Guidance and ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. Consultation and particip</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>Consult with the original designer</td>
<td>Landscape quality objectives/Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informed public discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Training and education</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training of specialists/Encouraging programmes of education at every level</td>
<td>Enhancement of education and training</td>
<td>Training and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Funding</td>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>Identify and attract funding for documentation and conservation</td>
<td>Implementation/Instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing for research, conservation and restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Questionnaire: The conservation of post-1945 Landscape Architecture
Questionnaire on the conservation of post-1945 Landscape Architecture

This questionnaire is conducted to establish what the underlying attitudes are towards the protection and conservation of landscape architecture that was created after the Second World War, on what these attitudes are based, and how this differs from landscape architecture from earlier periods. This understanding can inform how existing methods should be used, adapted or improved to achieve the best possible results in conservation of landscape architecture created after the Second World War.

The questionnaire collects views from those directly involved in the maintenance and management of sites, including the views of the wider public and visitors.

Please submit your answers by attaching pages or by e-mail. Feel free to add any relevant documentation.

Interview Details

Date:
Interviewer: Site:
Interviewee: Tel:
Organisation/company: E-mail:
Address:
Occupation/Involvement with site:

Questionnaire

• Q1. Many elements of the site’s appearance were created after the Second World War. What do you believe are the important features and aspects and why do you believe that they are important?

• Q2. Do you feel that there is a difference between the significance and value of the post-1945 elements and landscape architecture of the site, and that of the pre-war, and why?

• Q3. Many people have a low opinion about landscape architecture created after the Second World War. Why do you think this perception exists and what is your opinion?

• Q4. What problems do you see at the site regarding its conservation and why do you believe that these problems exist, and what do you feel should be done?

• Q5. Based on importance of the site’s elements created after the Second World War, do you feel that there are sufficient means in place to safeguard these post-1945 elements, and what else should be done and why?

• Q6. What should be taken into consideration when formulating the future policy for the site? On what should decisions be based?

• Q7. What and who is driving the decisions regarding the future policy for the site, who should be involved, and how did or do you participate in the decisions, or how could you be involved?

Thank you for spending time to provide these details.

Please address any queries to Jan Haenraets at 0131 659 5394 and e-mail the completed questionnaire to jahaen@hotmail.com
Or by post: St Margaret’s Gatehouse, 7A Restalrig Road South, EH7 6LF, Edinburgh
APPENDIX 3

The full lists of respondents is included as Table 4.5:
List of respondents (by targeted response groups)
The full lists of respondents is included as Table 4.5: List of respondents (by targeted response groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Case Study Site</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Interview or Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior Assistant</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Shop Assistant</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Property Manager</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Property Guide</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Planner</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Dunbar's Close</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Urban Parks Manager</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Dunbar's Close</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Urban Parks Manager</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Property Manager</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Property Manager</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Property Guide</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Property Guide</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Q/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td>Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>80-90</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>High Sutherland</td>
<td>80-90</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Designer, Artist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Garden Writer</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A27</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Academic, Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A28</td>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A29</td>
<td>Suntrap</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30</td>
<td>Suntrap</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Technician, Instructor</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31</td>
<td>Suntrap</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32</td>
<td>Suntrap</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33</td>
<td>Suntrap</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Not stated, retired</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>70-80</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Horticulturist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>Suntrap</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Academic, Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Academic, Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Academic, Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Academic, Landscape Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Scottish Widows</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Academic, Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Stirling Univ.</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Stirling Univ.</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>Suntrap</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Academic, Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Parks Manager</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>70-80</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Horticulturist, Presenter</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Falkland</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Garden Writer</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Garden Writer</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Garden Writer</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>70-80</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Horticulturist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Historic Landscape Specialist</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Landscape Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>70-80</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Retired, Garden Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16</td>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Historic Landscape Specialist</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17</td>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19</td>
<td>Scottish Widows</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20</td>
<td>Stirling Univ.</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21</td>
<td>Stirling Univ.</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>70-80</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Conservation Specialist</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Cumbernauld</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Dunbar's Close</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Landscape Consultant</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falkland Palace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Gender Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Historic Landscape Specialist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>Gibberd Garden</td>
<td>70-80</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Landscape Consultant</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>High Sutherland</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Architectural Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Horticulturist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Landscape Consultant, Garden Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Landscape Historian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>Portrack</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>Scottish Widows</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>Suntrap</td>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Retired, Horticulturist</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>Suntrap</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Not stated, retired</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>Suntrap</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Management Planner</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Bannockburn</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Little Sparta</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.2: A chronological overview of key initiatives by stakeholder organisations acting at an international level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organiser</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>First ICOMOS seminar on Twentieth Century heritage, Paris (Luxen, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO</td>
<td>Founding DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Gardens and Landscapes (Panzini, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>‘Global Strategy for a balanced World Heritage List’, to include less-represented categories such as Modern heritage. (UNESCO, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>ICOMOS Experts Seminar, Helsinki (ICOMOS, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>‘General recommendations on the protection of Twentieth Century heritage’ (ICOMOS, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>ICOMOS Expert Seminar, Mexico City (ICOMOS, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO Journal on ‘Urbanism, Gardens and Landscape’ (De Jonge et al., 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO Advisory Report to ICOMOS with a list of 100 buildings and sites (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>European Council</td>
<td>‘European Landscape Convention’ (Council of Europe, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>ICOMOS ‘Montreal Action Plan on Twentieth Century Heritage’ (Bumbaru, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>Start programme of identification of built heritage sites from the modern era to be considered for inclusion on the World Heritage List (Bandarin, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.2002</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO</td>
<td>Founding DOCOMOMO Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscape (De Jonge et al., 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>First Twentieth Century heritage sites included in ICOMOS Heritage at Risk lists (Denyer and Cresswell, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.2003</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO</td>
<td>Start Pilot Project on an Urban Register by the DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group and DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscape (DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscape, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>Founding ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage (2008b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>ICOMOS conference on Twentieth Century heritage, Moscow (ICOMOS Russia, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>Moscow Declaration on ‘Preservation of Twentieth Century Cultural Heritage’ (ICOMOS Russia, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Europa Nostra</td>
<td>Europa Nostra Forum ‘Add Modernism!’ session (Europa Nostra, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>ICOMOS conference on Twentieth Century heritage, Berlin (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage, 2007a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>ICOMOS conference on Twentieth Century heritage, Chicago (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage, 2007b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>ICOMOS International day for monuments and sites on ‘Cultural Landscapes and Monuments of Nature’ (ICOMOS, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO</td>
<td>Session on ‘Reconstructing Cities and Landscapes’ at the Tenth International DOCOMOMO Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO</td>
<td>Session on ‘Reconstructing Cities and Landscapes’ at the Tenth International DOCOMOMO Conference (DOCOMOMO The Netherlands, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 2007</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>Twentieth Century sites included in the list of most</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.3: A chronological overview of key initiatives by stakeholder organisations acting at a national level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organiser</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Adoption of the thirty-year rule for statutory listing (Page, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO UK</td>
<td>Exhibition ‘Modern Architecture Restored’ (Dunnett, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1991</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Post War Listing Steering Group and thematic buildings surveys launched (Powers, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 1992</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO national and regional working parties</td>
<td>Contributions to the compilation of registers (De Jonge et al., 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Management journal, Special Issue on ‘Cultural Resources from the Recent Past’ (Shiffer, 1993b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Booklet on ‘Preservation and the Recent Past’ (Striner, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO Scottish Working Group and Royal Fine Art Commission for Scotland</td>
<td>Organisation of ‘Mind Meetings’ (Glendinning, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>The National</td>
<td>Acquisition of the home of Erno Goldfinger, built in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Event/Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1939 (National Trust, 2008d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Little Sparta Trust</td>
<td>Founding of the Little Sparta Trust (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>'Preserving the Recent Past' conference (Slaton et al., 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Management journal, Special Issue on ‘Preserving the Recent Past’ (Shiffer and Park, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>'Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture’ conference (Birnbaum, 1999b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Wave Hill</td>
<td>Start of a catalogue of landscape records in the United States (Wave Hill, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Twentieth Century Society and Garden History Society</td>
<td>First conference on the history of post war gardens and landscapes in the United Kingdom (Moggridge, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Landscape Design Trust</td>
<td>Start publication series of monographs on eminent landscape architecture practitioners of the recent past (Harvey, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>'Preserving Post-War Heritage’ Conference (English Heritage, 1998a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO UK and University of East London</td>
<td>'The Modern City Revisited' conference (Dunnett, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Garden History Society</td>
<td>Publication on 'Reviewing the Twentieth Century Landscape’, (Woudstra and Ratti, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Book on ‘Pioneers of Landscape Design’ (Birnbaum and Karson, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>'Preserving the Recent Past II’ conference (Slaton and Foulks, 2000b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>ICOMOS UK</td>
<td>‘The Oxford Declaration on Landscape’ (ICOMOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Event/Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>ICOMOS UK</td>
<td>‘The Oxford Declaration on Landscape’ (ICOMOS UK, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>The London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust</td>
<td>Publication on ‘Span Housing: Post-War Landscape at Risk?’ (Simms, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Garden History Society</td>
<td>Online research ‘Post-war gardens collaboration’ (Garden History Society, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Association of Gardens Trusts and Gardens History Society</td>
<td>Post war gardens workshop (Brooks, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape Foundation</td>
<td>‘Pioneers of American Landscape Design: Rediscovering a Profession’s Legacy’ conference (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>‘Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture II: Making post-war designs visible’ conference (Birnbaum et al., 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Post War Listing Steering Group disbanded (Powers, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Preparation of a ‘Typology for Post 1945 Landscapes’ (Duterloo-Morgan, 2002a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.2003</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group</td>
<td>Start of the ‘Urban Register Pilot Project’ (Glendinning, 2004a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>The Cultural Landscape Foundation</td>
<td>Wave Hill catalogue transferred to the Cultural Landscape Foundation, as ‘Pioneers’ records (Wave Hill, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>The National Trust and Ashridge</td>
<td>Six-day Garden History Summer School on Twentieth Century gardens (Ashridge, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>‘Thematic survey on ‘Landscapes of the Post-War Housing Developments’, for the Register of Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organization/Project</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English Heritage and the Association of Garden Trusts</td>
<td>First ‘Modern Gardens Open Day’ in the United Kingdom (Richardson, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Launch of the ‘Recent Past Initiative’ web pages (Recent Past Initiative, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>‘Preserve and Play’ conference (Slaton et al., 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>ICOMOS UK</td>
<td>Conference on the implementation of the Landscape Convention in the United Kingdom (ICOMOS UK, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>DOCOMOMO US, Cultural Landscape Foundation and The National Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>‘Recent Past Toolbox’ and ‘Misfits of Modernism’ sessions at annual conference of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>The London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust</td>
<td>Publication on Eric Lyon &amp; Span (Simms, 2006b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>The London Historic Parks and Gardens Trust</td>
<td>Publication on use of concrete (Simms, 2006a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>Book on ‘Mission 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma’ (Carr, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Cultural Landscape Foundation</td>
<td>‘Cultural Landscapes as Classrooms’ project on ‘Icons of Modernism’ (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2008b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6

Table 8.1: A comparison between key findings from the literature review and the case study survey
Table 8.1: A comparison between key findings from the literature review and the case study survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER EIGHT</th>
<th>CHAPTER TWO</th>
<th>CHAPTER FIVE</th>
<th>CHAPTER SIX</th>
<th>CHAPTER SEVEN</th>
<th>CHAPTER NINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE STUDY SURVEY</td>
<td>LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>DESTRUCTION OF SITES</td>
<td>STATE OF INVENTORIES</td>
<td>INITIATIVES BY STAKEHOLDERS</td>
<td>FINAL CONCLUSIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Headings I to X of Table 4.8)</td>
<td>(Existing recommendations, Headings A to M of Table 2.1)</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Awareness and recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Promotion, raising awareness and communication</th>
<th>The lack of recognition for the recent past remains and an underlying threat to this heritage</th>
<th>Slowly interest is increasing for the subject</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not everyone has an opinion about landscapes of the recent past</td>
<td>Disseminate this knowledge throughout the professions</td>
<td>Too many sites remain at risk and are being damaged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not everyone has a low opinion about landscapes of the recent past</td>
<td>Use of media, publications, meetings, conferences, lectures, specialised bibliographies, and newer on-line technologies</td>
<td>Still an urgent need to increase awareness and recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many people have a positive opinion and find that there was good design from the recent past</td>
<td></td>
<td>Many more initiatives must be undertaken by all stakeholder groups to increase awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional designs are appreciated more easily, while people struggle more with newer design styles</td>
<td></td>
<td>An ongoing need for landscape professionals to promote the value of landscapes from the recent past and their work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People struggle to recognise what is relatively new as of heritage significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of people and the general public also change and evolve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of new styles takes time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of changing fashions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I.1 Impacts of lack of awareness and recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of recognition impacts the legal protection of sites</th>
<th>Effects of lack of awareness on funding for sites</th>
<th>Lack of awareness contributes to a lack of understanding of the significance of sites, and a lack of respect for sites</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many stakeholders undertake excellent management and maintenance plans, using conservation management plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose destruction and disfigurement of significant works of the modern movement</td>
<td>Physical neglect and poor maintenance of sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Concerns about management and maintenance of sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Management and maintenance programmes of sites</th>
<th>Maintenance and management</th>
<th>C. Management and maintenance programmes of sites</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2 Maintenance concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II.I Maintenance concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oppose destruction and disfigurement of significant works of the modern movement</th>
<th>Physical neglect and poor maintenance of sites</th>
<th>Many stakeholders undertake excellent maintenance of sites, using conservation management plans.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low opinions caused by poor maintenance of sites</td>
<td>Conservation treatments, instead of removal</td>
<td>Destruction of sites</td>
<td>Many significant sites, including listed sites, continue to struggle, often due to shortage of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to sites due to poor maintenance</td>
<td>Encourage restoration work</td>
<td>Many significant sites have already been lost</td>
<td>Some conservation organisations overlook the significance of layers of the recent past, and forget an assessment of significance of these layers during development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for continuity and commitment in maintenance</td>
<td>Landscape quality objectives</td>
<td>If for significant sites such problems exist, than this must be even more problematic for lesser-known sites.</td>
<td>Landscape professionals often remain ignorant and unaware of the importance of features of the recent past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower expectations of maintenance in public spaces</td>
<td>Develop stewardship ethos for treatment and management</td>
<td>Examples of good and bad practices exist, but shortcomings remain.</td>
<td>Landscape architects appear not to promote or protect sufficiently these sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with staffing levels, skills and equipment for maintenance</td>
<td>Investigations on a specific character of adaptive reuse</td>
<td>Progress was made, but more efforts are required.</td>
<td>There are calls for committee of experts that focus on the subject, within professional landscape architecture membership organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of impractical design and poor understanding of concepts on maintenance</td>
<td>Safeguard sites, ongoing maintenance and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost of maintenance</td>
<td>Innovative conservation approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The collapse and absence of proper management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for stewardship at properties rather than centralised management and committee decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The challenges of working with previous owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of poor management on opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Concerns about finance and budgets</td>
<td>M. Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funds</td>
<td>Providing funding for research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction over wasted funds</td>
<td>Identify and attract funding for conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns over funding partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising challenges to establish endowment funds and access obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The influence of finance and budgets on opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the United Kingdom, without statutory protection limited governmental grants are available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish proper funding for equipment, material and plants, and staffing. Work towards endowment funds for sites and address apparent waste of funds and business-run misuse of budgets. Promote a change of attitude by funding bodies towards recent past heritage and landscapes. Authorities should establish governmental grants. Avoid risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Challenges associated with materials and design</td>
<td></td>
<td>associated with exclusive private sector funding for commercialization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.1 Challenges associated with impractical and experimental design</td>
<td>Resolve challenges associated with impractical and experimental designs: Recognise the value of designs of the landscapes of the recent past, and look creatively for solutions to overcome challenges of impractical and experimental designs and planting schemes in significant landscapes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2 The influence of design on opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3 Challenges associated with materials and planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor materials and construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials cause practical challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical challenges of planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.4 The influence of materials on opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Shortcoming in conservation planning and development processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.1 Issues with the planning process and understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the recording of works</td>
<td>A need to better understand the importance of this heritage and the variety of sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of sites of the recent past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic documentation and investigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop stewardship ethos for documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making systematic inventories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Survey, analysis and evaluation of sites</td>
<td>Progress systematic identification, survey, evaluation and planning: Develop programmes to systematically progress the identification, recording, documentation, investigation, assessment and evaluation of sites. Document threatened sites. Support the development of conservation planning and management documentation for the conservation and protection of sites which should guide future de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of illustrative cases</td>
<td>Document threatened sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V.2 Development versus original design
- Inappropriate disfigurements of sites
- Avoid inappropriate disfigurements of sites and developments:
  - Use existing conservation planning and management documentation and processes to avoid inappropriate changes to sites.

### V.3 Issues with what is driving planning and development decisions
- J. Monitor and record keeping
  - Ensure proper homes for archives
  - Retaining archives of documentation is essential. The study demonstrated that in general many archives and depositories exist, but more initiatives to also establish special collections on landscapes of the recent past are needed and should be encouraged.
  - Improve monitoring and record keeping, and ensure proper archives:
    - Integrate monitoring in the conservation process and retain accessible archives and records for site-specific documentation, landscape architects’ archives, and general records on the subject of landscapes of the recent past.

### V.4 The influence of planning and development processes on opinions
- J. Monitor and record keeping
  - Improve collecting, keeping and treatment of documentation
  - A clear overview of available resources and access to documentation remains an issue.

### VI. Challenges with consulting and involving people

#### VI.1 Responses relating to who should be involved and consulted
- Participation
  - Several initiatives have been taken forward through involvement of the wider public
  - Integrate consultation and participation in all aspects of the conservation process:
    - Assure an informed public discourse that involves all stakeholders categories, and consult original designers when possible.
    - Encourage participation to enhance ownership.

- Agency or Government Organisations
  - Informed public discourse
  - Many opportunities for participation and involvement remain unexplored

- Charitable Trusts and Voluntary Organisations
  - Consult with the original designer
  - The wider public and volunteers can still make more significant contributions towards enhancing awareness and conservation

- Enterprises and Consultants
- Day to Day Management
- Wider Public and Visitors
- Training and Educational Institutions: No specific mention
- Private and Public Repositories: No specific mention

#### VI.2 General concerns about the involvement of people
- H. Cooperation and partnerships
  - Absence of consultation with the original designer in redevelopment projects raised as a major concern.

#### VI.3 The influence of involvement of people on public opinions about landscapes of the recent past
- H. Cooperation and partnerships
  - Improve conservation practice through cooperation and partnerships:
Work out a programme of international cooperation

Mutual technical assistance and coordination of effort

Multilateral conservation projects

Forging partnerships between preservation professionals and the building owners

Joint policies

Creative partnerships

Only a limited number of initiatives were found that relate to the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past.

Much progress still needs to be made in this area.

Addressing shortcomings, cooperation and participation can be a very useful tool to increase the number of initiatives that support the conservation of sites.

Similarly cooperation can help with improving conservation practice through the exchange of knowledge and experiences.

Interdisciplinary cooperation is advisable, to avoid both working in isolation.

Cooperation can also lead towards more consistency of approaches.

International cooperation and partnerships must also be further explored.

There are in particular few non-governmental organisations in the United Kingdom with a specific mission to address the conservation of designed landscapes from the recent past.

The Cultural Landscape Foundation which is active in the United States remains unique and a similar initiative would be beneficial in the United Kingdom.

Set up a specialist organisation to promote stewardship and conservation of landscapes, including designed landscapes of the recent past:

Use examples from abroad to establish a new organisation for this purpose, or to integrate such missions in existing landscape organizations.

**VII. Concerns about legal protection and politics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection</th>
<th>B. Legal protection and listing</th>
<th>B. Legal protection and listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited statutory protection</td>
<td>Protection and legislation</td>
<td>In many cases with sites there are ongoing problems and this even though there are a number of protective measures and recommendations in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing is not always welcomed</td>
<td>Prepare registers and pursue nominations</td>
<td>While a number of recommendations for measures to protect sites exist, the existing systems fail to protect these sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funding for listing work</td>
<td>Practical measures for legal protection</td>
<td>Landscape specialists need to be more involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Need for changed attitudes | Make in regard of selection | The United States government also announced in 2003 a Historic Rehabilitation Tax Incentives. | Improve the efficiency of legal protection and registration of landscapes of the recent past:

There needs to be better statutory protection and control for significant sites of the recent past, with grants easier made available for the conservation of sites. Actions towards documenting and registering must improve to include more landscapes of the recent past, as landscapes lag behind in comparison to achievements for buildings. Stakeholder organisations can make significant contributions towards inventories, and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politics surrounding sites</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor accessibility of inventories</td>
<td>Restricted thematic search options of inventories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of pro-active initiatives in the United Kingdom to nominate sites for governmental listing</td>
<td>Absence of initiatives by specialist groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for better statutory protection and control for sites on inventories</td>
<td>The importance of non-listed sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified inventories and allowing the listing of groups of features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Conclusions:**

Much work is being done by several governmental and non-governmental organisations. Approaches differ though.

Work on landscapes is still lagging behind in comparison with buildings.

Overviews of work done by different organisations is also lacking and there needs to be more of integrated thinking.

Actions towards documenting and registering sites are still not achieving the desired results.

Special working groups could address the backlog in listing sites.

The protection of significant designed landscapes deserves as much attention as buildings.

Some of the key non-governmental organisations that focus on the heritage of the recent past should all review their activities to include designed landscapes more in their activities.

---

### VIII. Concerns about social problems and vandalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vandalism and anti-social behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The impact of public involvement on social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The influence of social issue on people's opinions of landscapes of the recent past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vandalism and anti-social behaviour

The impact of public involvement on social behaviour

The influence of social issue on people's opinions of landscapes of the recent past

---

### IX. Concerns about marketing and commercialisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing difficulties</th>
<th>D. Promotion, raising awareness and communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving merchandising and retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger of commercially and business driven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marketing difficulties

Improving merchandising and retail

Danger of commercially and business driven

---

Increase promotion and marketing of landscapes of the recent past: Increase the promotion and marketing of landscapes of the recent past but in the existing inventory work should be promoted and made accessible to the wider public.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>X. Concerns about education, enjoyment, interpretation and access</strong></th>
<th><strong>L. Training and education</strong></th>
<th><strong>L. Training and education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>X.1 Education and Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>Training of specialists</td>
<td>There are very few activities that focus specifically on the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational curriculum does not use landscapes of the recent past sufficiently</td>
<td>Encouraging programmes of education at every level</td>
<td>Existing courses do however provide general training in horticultural skills, landscaping and conservation, and the existing principles and methods are already a sound basis for the variety of work that is required for the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational facilities required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special training with an emphasis on aspects of landscapes of the recent past would though greatly enhance practice at many levels and enable sharing of understanding and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public education on the importance and relevance of landscape to our daily lives and well being</td>
<td></td>
<td>A threat to the maintenance of these sites in the United Kingdom is the developing skills shortages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation as most important for the sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>More academic initiatives should be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X.2 Enjoyment and access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognise and manage impacts of access and enjoyment of sites:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of increased access</td>
<td></td>
<td>The impact of increasing access and various types of access must be recognized and managed. Limitations on access should be allowed by funding bodies to safeguard values and integrity of sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding bodies and access requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access for the disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety implications of access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual opening period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of children and dogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper visitor facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and anti-social behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Development of national strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate a national strategy</td>
<td>The lack of sufficient dedicated initiatives at governmental level in the United Kingdom towards the protection and conservation of landscapes of the recent past highlights the need for a clear national strategy to address the shortcomings and issues. Improve the understanding of planting challenges</td>
<td>Formulate national strategies: Governmental organisations and key non-governmental bodies, conservation organisations and professional landscape architecture membership organisations should formulate a national strategy for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop national guidance and ethics

Implementation

Non-governmental organisations such as the Twentieth Century Society have their strategic objectives, but again proper strategies for landscapes remain absent.

Non-governmental organisations such as the Twentieth Century Society have their strategic objectives, but again proper strategies for landscapes remain absent.

| F. Understanding the wider context of landscape architecture of the recent past |
| F. Understanding the wider context of landscape architecture of the recent past |
| Explore and develop the knowledge of landscapes of the recent past and the full diversity of issues |
| Need to enhance our understanding of the wider context. |
| Attention is required to all types |
| Few studies looking into the conservation aspects and technological challenges. |
| Establish a larger context for contemporary landscape architecture |
| Explore and develop the knowledge of landscapes of the recent past and the full diversity of issues, with more studies on the conservation and technological challenges. Establish a larger context for contemporary landscape architecture and the history and aesthetics of landscapes of the recent past. |
| Understanding of their aesthetics |
| Improving the understanding of the wider context and full diversity of landscape architecture of the recent past: |
| Improving the understanding of the wider context and full diversity of landscape architecture of the recent past: |

| G. Use of established methods and principles |
| G. Use of Established Methods and Principles |
| Use established principles, standards and guidelines of conservation |
| A key conclusion is that existing conservation methodologies are suitable for sites of all periods, including of the recent past. |
| Cooperation and joint policies |
| Where poor conservation practice was observed standard conservation principles were being ignored. |
| Insisting on strict application of internationally approved scientific principles |
| Those involved in the conservation of sites must therefore be stimulated to apply existing methodologies and principles to their conservation actions for sites of the recent past. |
| A specific convention or manifesto on the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past is still missing. |
| Use the current and established standards, methods and principles for conservation: |
| Use the current and established standards, methods and principles for conservation: |
| Existing conservation methodologies are suitable for sites of all periods, including landscapes of the recent past. Stakeholders and professionals must follow existing methodologies and principles in the conservation process. |
| The preparation of an international charter or guideline on the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past: |
| The preparation of an international charter or guideline on the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past: |
| None of the existing guidelines or recommendations cover comprehensively the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past. This leads to the conclusion that an international charter, guideline or manifesto on the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past is still missing. |
Many initiatives exist, but significant gaps remain. From the research it is clear that many actions have already been undertaken to address existing recommendations. Nevertheless ongoing action is needed as many concerns and shortcomings continue to exist, with significant landscapes of the recent past still being damaged or lost.

Landscapes require more attention. Many organisations play a role, but few have a strong focus on landscapes of the recent past. Efforts must be made to give landscapes of the recent past more attention. Many stakeholders and organisations take initiatives forward, but too few focus on landscapes of the recent past.

A need for overviews of existing initiatives. Prepare accessible data and overviews of existing initiatives.

A need for overviews of initiatives and of who is doing what, and who should be doing what. Compile accessible overviews of who is doing what, and who should be doing what, with suggestions of actions for specific disciplinary categories.

Recommendations appear needed that are more site specific and of local relevance. Develop recommendations that are more site specific and of local relevance.
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In recent years several books have been published on the subject of gardens and parks created after the Second World War and their designers. While it appears that landscapes from the recent past are receiving more recognition, sites still make the headlines for being disfigured and demolished. To review the current situation in the United Kingdom, a summary of key initiatives and suggestions for action will be discussed below.

A GRADUAL CHANGE OF ATTITUDE TOWARDS HERITAGE OF THE RECENT PAST

In the 1980s in the United Kingdom it became clear that many fine post-war sites were under threat. Conservation organisations were starting to press for changes to allow post-war sites to be listed, arguing that history does not stop. In response English Heritage in 1987 began a thirty-year rolling rule, instead of confining listing to 1940 already existed in Scotland. The same rule was extended to the 1960s in the 2005 Town and Country Planning Act. Threatened buildings of outstanding quality and at least ten years old could now be listed under "exceptional circumstances". In the United States a fifty-year rolling rule had already been used since 1979 for the National Register together with special guidelines for evaluating and nominating properties that achieved significance within the past fifty years.

In 1985 ICOMOS organised its first seminar on twentieth century heritage and DOCOMOMO was founded in 1988. The Eindhoven Statement called for promotion, registers, identification, the development of techniques and methods, retaining archives and funding. The Council of Europe's first colloquy on the subject in 1989 culminated in the Recommendation on the Protection of the Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage in 1991. It also emphasised the need for training, education, and international cooperation. UNESCO acknowledged by 1994 the need for a more balanced and representative World Heritage List. ICOMOS, instructed by UNESCO, prepared General Recommendations on the Protection of Twentieth Century Heritage, with mention that established principles provide a basis for the conservation of recent heritage. ICOMOS and DOCOMOMO identified sites for inclusion on the UNESCO World Heritage List and by 2003 twelve Modern Heritage properties were included.

Changing attitudes encouraged English Heritage in the mid 1990s to organise an exhibition on "The Age of Optimism: Post-war Architecture in England 1945-70", and to publish brochures on "Something Worth Keeping" and "Post War Architecture in England". In the United States the first special themed journals and books on the recent past and construction materials were published. Two Preserving the Recent Past Conferences were organised in the US, in 1995 and 2000, and English Heritage held a "Modern Matters" and "Preserving post-war heritage" conference.

The Challenges of Change - Dealing with the Legacy of the Modern Movement
Dirk van den Hevel, Maarten Knepper, Wilf Quest, Bert Lemmens (eds.)
Ish Press, 2008. © 2008 Ish Press and the authors. All rights reserved.
THE CONSERVATION OF RECENT LANDSCAPES STARTS TO RECEIVE ATTENTION

Landscapes only occasionally featured in the mentioned initiatives and the 1995 New York conference on 'Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture: Making post-war designs visible' was the first specific dedicated event on landscapes. Charles Birnbaum's suggestions for action echoed existing recommendations but he added the need for archives and consultation, in particular with original designers. He urged for national strategies, a special committee with historians and scholars, and better understanding of the wider subject. Richard Haag suggested techniques for pro-active action by landscape architects indicating that existing recommendations have limited suggestions for site specific and local action. DOCOMOMO's focus was primarily on buildings but in 1994 an International Specialist Committee on Gardens and Landscapes was founded, and later became a committee on urbanism and landscapes.

In the United Kingdom landscape initiatives picked up slowly. A Masters dissertation by Fiddy Dutlelo, who became involved in English Heritage's post-war landscapes work, was completed in 1995 as a first sign of increasing interest. The English Heritage Post-War Listing Steering Group for buildings suggested in 1997 that it would be available to work with the Gardens Register Team on designations of post-war gardens and landscapes, and the Steering Group liaised with the Twentieth Century Society and the Garden History Society towards the Twentieth Century gardens and landscapes conference in 1998.
CONSERVING RECENT LANDSCAPES GAINS A TEMPORARY MOMENTUM

The European Landscape Convention provided in 2000 a new stimulus to encourage countries to implement landscape measures. These were to be applicable to remarkable as well as ordinary everyday landscapes and also to those of the recent past. The 2001 ICOMOS Montreal Action Plan on Twentieth Century Heritage lobbied towards comprehending the full diversity of such heritage and its conservation. The Wave Hill Charter on the Preservation of Modern Landscape Architecture, signed at the second Preservation of Modern Landscape Architecture conference urged for the development of national guidance and ethics before it became too late, and seminal works destroyed without public discourse. In the wake of these conferences the Cultural Landscape Foundation and the Recent Past Preservation Network were founded in the United States. The Cultural Landscape Foundation remains unique in its pro-active campaigning for recent past landscapes.

In the United Kingdom the proposed relocation of Gibberd’s Water Gardens in Harlow New Town put the issue higher onto English Heritage agendas by 2001. The Water Gardens were listed as Grade II* and seen as exceptional historic interest. Since 1997 English Heritage had opposed relocation. The Twentieth Century Society, the Garden History Society, and Lady Gibberd raised concerns but Harlow Council granted Wilson Bowden Development Limited planning consent, with delisting of the Water Gardens as a consequence. Many examples of disfigured sites can be found, the ‘Landslides - Landscapes at Risk’ web pages of the Cultural Landscape Foundation give plenty other cases. The case of the Denver Skyline Park was presented in a paper at the 2004 DOCOMOMO conference in New York. Destruction and disfigurement of sites can be categorised under four levels:

- Physical neglect and poor maintenance practice
- Impact of change and increasing intensity of use, misuse, and vandalism
- Inappropriate modifications
- Destruction and demolition

The case of the Water Gardens meant that the subject remained for some years on English Heritage agendas with a post-post war landscapes typology and some study themes being developed. The Garden History Society launched an online collaborative research on post-war gardens and the DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group developed ideas for an Urban Register to explore new ways to document urban areas and landscaping components. More publications on recent past landscapes were published, such as the monographs on eminent designers by the Landscape Design Trust. Most of these mainly highlighted iconic sites and their designers, rather than conservation issues.

Figure 2: The Barlow in London by Chamberlin, Powell and Bon is one of the post World War II sites listed by English Heritage on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest
Source: Jon Wilmot.
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Figure 3: Princes of Brussels in the Bois de Boulogne with Views of Landscape Design by Robert<br>Bruny. Source: Ian Hawkins.<br>

Figure 4: Recreation and education in Richard Garnett's Adventure Playground in<br>Central Park, New York, was threatened after much debate, but also consultation<br>with the designer. Source: Ian Hawkins.<br>

The feeling was that from 1992 to 2002 English Heritage made good progress towards the listing of buildings from the recent past. With the disbanding of the Post War Listing Steering Group in 2002, things again appeared to be going backwards, with the government not committing to the subject. Interest in recent post landscapes and their conservation also appeared to have improved by 2001, but while conservation principles and recommendations for improving conservation practice existed the downgrading of many sites continued. Of the 1450 sites on English Heritage's Register of Parks and Gardens in 2003 there were still only fourteen 'post-war' sites on the Register, with Gibberd's Water Garden being de-listed. A general conclusion was that more progress was made towards the conservation of post-war buildings and post landscapes than remained much work to do.

UNDERSTANDING CURRENT ISSUES

To gain more clarity about the present situation a survey was undertaken by the writer to gather views and opinions. People were contacted from on-site management of gardens and parks, staff and owners; the local community including friends groups and neighbours; students, academics, lecturers; the wider public including visitors; conservation professionals; and architects and designers. 146 people were contacted and 102 completed a questionnaire or were interviewed. This survey amounted to a total of 807 individual concerns being raised. The case study sites used were the Gibberd Garden (Harlow), Little Sparta (Dwnsley), Dunbar's Close Garden (Edinburgh), Cumbernauld New Town, Barrockburn Battlefield Heritage Site (Stirling), Suntrap Garden (Edinburgh), Scottish Widows (Edinburgh), Falkland Palace Garden and Portrack Garden (Holywood, Dunfries). Designers that have been involved in some capacity at these sites include Dame Sylvia Crowe, Percy Cane, Sir Robert Matthew, Frederic Stevenson, Frank Clark; Bill Gillespie, Ian Hamilton Finlay, Charles Jencks, Maggie Keswick, Boyd Anderson and Sir Frederick Gibberd.

From the analysis of responses several issues can be taken into account:

a. People's opinions and the lack of recognition remain an underlying threat to the recent past.

Many factors contribute to the lack of recognition.

From the survey it becomes clear that not everyone has an opinion, at times due to lack of interest or because people in general are unaware of such landscapes.

Many people find that there is good recent design. Traditional design styles are easier to appreciate than newer design trends.

Low opinions are often associated with the fact that sites are deemed too new to be historically significant.
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The association people make of recent design with poorly made second rate examples of urban landscaping contributed to low opinions, as did the association of landscapes with poor architecture of the period.

Private landscaping is perceived as better quality.

Bad press, ignorance about the landscaping industry, an atmosphere of criticism by association influence opinions and cause landscapes to take second place.

The way sites were developed, the inappropriate way of thinking by designers and professionals, and materials and styles used were noted as arguments for poor appreciation.

The lack of documented histories and understanding of the period continues to affect recognition.

Changing fashions influence opinions, and people's opinions evolve, but complacency and accepting some losses does not improve people's perceptions either.

b. Concerns about poor management and maintenance of sites

Management and maintenance standards at sites, such as the visible process of decline of prominent related social issues, all influence opinions.

Those involved voiced worries about the means to provide practical staffing levels and equipment for maintaining standards.

Proper qualifications and better understanding of sites in their historical context are wished for.

It is also recognised that those involved must as far as necessary undertake their responsibilities.

There is perceived lack of interest even from those responsible towards sites from this period.

c. The impact of social problems and vandalism

Respondents saw an important need for addressing social problems such as, vandalism and security issues. They saw this for the well being of the community and of the site. It was recognised that communities have an important role to play in this process.

d. Continuing challenges associated with materials and design

It was perceived that a use of poor materials, experimental approaches, a narrow range of plants, together with unrealistic and unpractical designs have caused practical challenges.

In addition, the designs do not always inspire support as people struggle to connect with them.

Unavailability of original designs and intent also complicate these concerns.

e. Concerns about education, enjoyment, interpretation, access

The importance of education and access is recognised. But opening hours, events to generate income, general wear and tear, access for dogs, groups and children, the impact of facilitating better access, health and safety regulations were viewed as conflicts.

Related to learning, staff mentioned concerns about long-term availability of vision and skills, and the continuity of maintenance.

f. Ongoing financial concerns

One of the major concerns is shortage of funding for equipment, material, plants, and staffing. On-site staff wishes for endowment funds and a change of attitude by funding bodies. The difficulty to tap into major public funding and commercialisation risks associated with exclusive private sector funding were raised, as was the apparent waste of funds and business-run misuse of budgets.
g. Shortcoming in planning and development processes:
- The structure and selection of project teams, unrealistic time schedules, poor understanding of
  the original concept, ignorance of teams, ad-hoc and piecemeal approaches, and poor
  planning methodologies were all mentioned as contributors to poor development of the
  parks and gardens.
- Many find that design competitions are mostly inappropriate. Subtle approaches mostly
  receive no support, with non-sensitive big impact schemes being voted for.
- Planning was at times branded as inconvenient while at other times a cause for inaction.
  The wider setting and holistic context of sites also needed to be taken more into account.

h. Involving and consulting the right people
- Planning processes still frequently fall short with regard to holistic interdisciplinary
  approaches and wider consultation.
- Staff at sites wish for greater involvement and note that the original designers are rarely
  consulted for ongoing planning.

i. Difficulties of marketing and damage through popularity
- Marketing people remarked that they struggle to promote sites from the recent past, while
  increasing popularity at certain sites was creating new problems in increased use.

j. Unsupportive legislation and politics
- The lack of proper supportive legal protection and legislation comes up frequently.
- It was noted that listing is not always helpful and that politics surrounding sites cause
  conflicts.

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE ACTION

Initiatives and lessons learned from the survey and revisiting past recommendations, result in
thirteen main areas for action:
1. Survey, analysis and evaluation of sites
2. Legal protection and listing
3. Management and maintenance programmes of sites
4. Promotion, raising awareness and communication
5. Development of our understanding of used technologies and materials
6. Understanding the wider context of landscape architecture of the recent past
7. Use of established methods and principles
8. Cooperation and partnerships
9. Development of rational strategies
10. Monitor and record keeping
11. Consultation and participation
12. Training and education
13. Funding

The following points must also be addressed:
- An international overarching charter on the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent
  past is still missing;
- Recommendations that are more site specific and of local relevance are needed;
- Suggestions for specific disciplinary groups to take recommendations forward are needed;
Lessons and approaches can be learned from other disciplines, especially buildings conservation; and

Increased integration between processes is still needed.

It can be concluded that progress has been made, but ongoing efforts are required with much work remaining to be done. Concerns raised and identified in the research can be developed into actions and recommendations under the above headings to prevent a downward spiral of this valuable heritage.

NOTES

2. Sherfy, M. and Ivice, W.R., 1998. Guidelines for evaluating and nominating properties that have achieved significance within the past fifty years, National Park Service, Washington, DC
10. Shifler, R.A. (ed.), 1993, ‘Special Issue: Cultural Resources from the Recent Past’, CRM, 16:1
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Poster Display: Battling For Modernism - Rethinking and safeguarding a significant recent landscape at the Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Site

6th INTERNATIONAL DOMOCOM CONGRESS
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OTHER MODERNISMS - Everyday Modernisms and Urban Environment
BATTING FOR MODERNISM - RETHINKING AND SAFEGUARDING A SIGNIFICANT
RECENT LANDSCAPE AT THE BANNOCKBURN BATTLEFIELD MEMORIAL SITE

1. The Battle of Bannockburn and the commemorative tradition of the Bannockburn site

The Battle of Bannockburn, a key battle of the Scottish Wars of Independence, was fought on the 23rd-24th June 1314. Against overwhelming odds the Scots emerged victorious over the English forces which had landed at St Andrews. The Battle of Bannockburn is now seen as one of the most important events in Scottish history and one of the most significant events in the history of the world. It marked the end of the medieval period and the beginning of the modern period.

2. A need to redevelop the Bannockburn memorial site

By 2002 many of the features that made the site a popular visitor centre were outdated. High maintenance of the site was causing issues for visitors and the site was not meeting the demands of the modern tourist industry.

3. A need to redevelop the Bannockburn memorial site

By 2002 many of the features that made the site a popular visitor centre were outdated. High maintenance of the site was causing issues for visitors and the site was not meeting the demands of the modern tourist industry.

4. Starting to understand the story of the site

The story of the site has been developed by working with local communities, historians, and visitors to create a narrative that is relevant and engaging for all audiences.

5. Learning lessons

The lessons learned from the Bannockburn site can be applied to other similar sites across the world.
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BATTLING FOR MODERNISM - RETHINKING AND SAFEGUARDING A
SIGNIFICANT RECENT LANDSCAPE AT THE BANNOCKBURN BATTLEFIELD
MEMORIAL SITE

JAN HAENRAETS
The National Trust for Scotland
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1. The Battle of Bannockburn and the commemorative tradition of the Borestone site

The Battle of Bannockburn, a key battle of the Scottish Wars of Independence, was fought on the 23rd-24th June 1314. Against overwhelming odds the Scots celebrated an unlikely victory over the English led by King Edward II. The Battle of Bannockburn is now seen as one of the most important events to have taken place on Scottish soil and in the Scottish psyche stands for ideas of herosim, freedom, independence, and nationalism (Alexander and Cairns 2002, 6). The Borestone site, managed by The National Trust for Scotland (NTS) since 1931, is by tradition the place where Bruce positioned himself on 23rd June 1314. When in the 1930s Stirling Council planned to acquire the site for housing this hallowed ground was saved by a National Committee. The site was an open field with Brock’s Brae Road running through it, along which the Borestone was positioned, and a flagstaff erected by Dumbarton & Stirling Ledges in 1870.

A commemorative stone cairn was built in 1957 by the Guildry of Stirling, and an ambitious modernist scheme was realized in the 1960s by the Trust, with visitor facilities near the roadside and at the hilltop a concrete rotunda enframing the flagstaff and cairn, and nearby a bronze equestrian statue of King Robert the Bruce, by Charles d’Orville Pilkington Jackson. The Queen unveiled the scheme on the occasion of 650th Anniversary of the Battle in 1964.

2. A need to redevelop the Bannockburn memorial site

By 2002 many were of the opinion that the much altered visitor centre was impractical, high maintenance, of poor Sixties design, wrongly positioned and dominating the site. The grounds had an appearance of a public park and were used as such, and it was argued that the rotunda, an interpretative vehicle to channel the visitor’s views and the site’s most controversial structure, no longer carried out its original function, presented numerous management problems and detracted from the visitor experience. The overall presentation was called ‘unworthy of the national importance of the site in historic terms, and of those who gave their lives there’ (Walker 2004) and did not show the Trust in a good light. As a result the Trust decided to launch the Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Project to drastically redevelop the site. A competitive tendering process resulted in design proposals for a new state-of-the-art visitor centre with a battle theatre, iconic viewing tower, parkland with interpretative walks and artworks reflecting the idea of the existing setting at the time of the battle (Kliskey 2004, 17-21). The rotunda, visitor centre, flagpole, cairn and existing landscaping layout would all be removed.
3. **Spot listing and a project grounded to a halt**

After the sketches for the rotunda by Sir Robert Matthew were discovered in 2003, Historic Scotland decided to fast track the hilltop features, including the rotunda, for Category A listing, but excluding the visitor centre. A tweaked proposal retaining the listed features was hastily prepared without further in-depth research, but the project ground to a halt due to a lack of financial backing. An evaluation of the project and proposals was required. Several obvious factors appeared to have contributed to the stalling, including a funding-led approach, a poor understanding of the Trust’s past development of the site, project management and planning shortcomings, and the simultaneous (more successful) fundraising for the Trust’s Culloden Battlefield Project.

4. **Starting to understand the story of the memorial site**

The momentary halting of the project provided an opportunity for the Trust to study, assisted by student and volunteer research, the site’s design philosophy, evolution, and layout. Understanding, analysis and proper assessment of all layers of the site’s evolution was a fundamental shortcoming in the project which could now be tackled.

It became clear that the stone Cairn was erected in 1957, after heated debates about the proposals by Charles d’Orville Pilkington Jackson and William Kininmonth to build a battle hall, recreation park with children’s playground, cafeteria, tower viewpoint, cinema, and stone statue of Robert the Bruce (NTS 1955). The ‘modest’ Cairn was felt to be more appropriate and local residents had protested against a tower. By the 1960s, at a time when tourist development plans and ‘Reception by the Roadside’ was being encouraged in Scotland (Lord Wemyss 1962, 9), the Trust launched a ‘Chain-Link’ programme of ‘Road Halts’ providing ‘History on the Spot’. Bannockburn would become the gateway for visitors to Scotland and the Trust’s sites (Stormont
Darling 1960). Pilkington Jackson and Kininmonth again put their ideas forward for visitor facilities, a 30 ft viewing tower and the Bruce statue (Lord Elgin 1960), but in a controversial move the Trust appointed Professor Sir Robert Matthew as project architect, with Eric Stevenson as assistant. A deeply disappointed Pilkington Jackson was only asked to sculpt the equestrian statue of the Bruce, while a furious Kininmonth in the end only got to design the statue’s granite pedestal. The enforced Matthew-Pilkington Jackson partnership never seemed to have been an amicable one.

![Figure 5: 1960s concept proposal (NTS/Stevenson)](image)

![Figure 6: The site in 1964 (Tom Sout/NTS)](image)

In Matthew’s concept for a hilltop scheme and roadside facilities the visitors would arrive via a covered way at an open piazza, with a visitor centre (later designed by Ninian Johnston), restaurant, hotel, shop and petrol station, this adding up to possibly Scotland’s first service halt. From the piazza a landscaped walk with banks of trees and shrubs would lead up to the rounda. Planting had to screen views and create a feeling of informality with tree clumps, bushes, mown and scythed grass. Frank Clark provided planting advice (Stormonth Darling 1962) and a new technique of transplanting large semi-mature trees was used for a first time in Scotland. There are suggestions that Matthew’s inspiration for the concept and rotunda came from Asplund’s Woodland Cemetery in Stockholm, much admired and visited by Matthew. His original design for a timber rotunda suggested a temporary stockade as might have existed here during the battle and the ‘wheeling action’ by which the Bruce brought his troops out of concealment (NTS 1962). After Matthew’s resignation, Stevenson modified designs to reduce costs and as a result concrete, a timber ring and display panels were used.

![Figure 7: Rotunda displays in 1964 (Mae Pherison/NTS)](image)

5. **Learning lessons**

The research has already resulted in a thorough understanding of the 20th Century layers, which
will be essential to inspire improved redevelopment proposals. However, the study also uncovered other key issues that need addressing, of which a couple will be highlighted:

An antipathy towards architecture and landscape architecture of the modernist period, a funding-driven approach, the poor understanding of the site’s evolution, combined with a process of decline all contributed to shortcomings in the Bannockburn Memorial Project and the unsatisfactory redevelopment proposals. The Trust had opted for an interpretation led redevelopment as the property is an educational resource that attracts about 16,000 school children annually, but by requesting designers to put competitively new designs forward rather than sensitive proposals, the project became design and funding driven. The Trust also lost control over budgets and individual aspects of the project by appointing a consultant team, rather than specialists separately managed and headed by the Trust.

The Trust’s soft approach over recent years towards the management of the site, and attempt to keep everyone pleased by avoiding confrontation, rather than resolving problems, reflects a lack of investment, and means a battle of ownership and control is being lost. In addition local and organisational politics, electoral timetables, and Scottish identity are at play at Bannockburn. The psyche of Bannockburn tends to be used controversially for nationalism, rather than for its ideas of freedom, independence, and patriotism. The listing potentially gives rise to problems as it lists the structures rather than the concept. A non-integrated listing goes against the fundamental philosophy of Matthew and Stevenson’s vision, and overlooks the wider ‘Reception by the Roadside’ philosophy. Stirling Council’s utter indifference jeopardised the setting by permitting unattractive housing at the margins of the site.

Research now shows that there is much more to the Bannockburn and the modernist concept than initially appreciated. The potential of the site is huge and by 2014, the 700th anniversary of the battle, the site should once again be at the heart of the nation. To revive the Bannockburn site, the Trust will have to tackle many more issues. Ironically one of the biggest challenges at Bannockburn is now a battle for modernism or how to safeguard a significant landscape of the recent past and make it relevant for the future. The Trust will have to employ its vast interdisciplinary experience and expertise to celebrate another victory at Bannockburn.
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Research Report: Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Site - The Development of Bannockburn Since 1930 by the National Trust for Scotland

Research Report prepared by Jan Haenraets (2008) within the context of the research for this thesis. A contents list and background is included to clarify the scope of the research report.
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In 2003-04 the National Trust for Scotland undertook a new project to redevelop the Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Site. During this project it became clear that in the more than seventy years that the Trust had managed this heritage site it had redeveloped the site significantly. A clear overview of the different stages of this development and its significance was however not available. It became evident that the development of the site by the Trust in the recent past also amounted to a significant part of the history of the site and needed to be better understood to inform the redevelopment proposals.

As it turned out the redevelopment of the site was postponed in late 2004. This allowed time for research into the background of the development of the site in the Twentieth Century by the Trust. Such research was undertaken by Jan Haenraets from 2004 to 2007, with this report on ‘Bannockburn Battlefield Memorial Site - The Development Of Bannockburn since 1930 By The National Trust For Scotland’ being the result. The report was submitted in 2008 to the new Bannockburn Project Group which was set up in 2008 to coordinate a new redevelopment project for the site.

The research undertaken by Jan Haenraets was inspired by his ongoing Phd research on the subject of identifying problems regarding the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past at De Montfort University, Leicester. The report was prepared on a voluntary basis with the input of a number of garden volunteers at the Trust Gardens Office, this under the supervision of Jan Haenraets. Initial research into Trust archives was done by Jan Haenraets with the aid of Regina Davidson. Historical photographs and maps were collected by Jan Haenraets. Melissa Bluhm, who undertook a student placement in the Gardens Office assisted Jan Haenraets in compiling the documentation in a report format, and elaborated the comparative study of the historical plans and the development of individual components of the design (Chapter 7-9).
Given the fact that the document has been prepared on a voluntary basis this draft report still requires detailed editing and further elaboration of the analytical chapters. It is though hoped that the report as it stands already brings together significant historical documentation to support the future preparation of a Conservation Management Plan for the site.