

REGENERATION: Heritage Leads the Way  
**HERITAGE CANADA FOUNDATION 40th Anniversary Conference**  
**October 31 – November 2, 2013 - Fairmont Chateau Laurier Hotel - Ottawa, Ontario**

**New Heritage Frontiers: Heritage, Landscape and Sustainability**  
 Graham Fairclough

## **1. Introduction**

What I will talk about today is

- Newer definitions of what heritage actually is, its intangibility as well as its materiality
- The social embedded-ness of heritage, and what it means to people and what is to be used for
- The connections between heritage and landscape, place and sustainability

And therefore the emergence of new attitudes and approaches, perhaps even the beginning of a regeneration of the heritage process itself - perhaps even the beginning of a regeneration of the heritage process itself.

It is easy to think of conservation and heritage protection as something which is here to stay. After all, it has evolved naturally and inevitably over the past century and a half, hasn't it? And human progress is always linear. But few ideas, principles or aims are absolute and eternal. Like almost all ideas and habits, 'heritage' and 'conservation' arose from specific circumstances, and are thus historically contingent. They did not always exist, and they may not always be with us. I suggest that heritage is already in a transition to quite different social and cultural, not to mention environmental and political, contexts. How will 'heritage' change? It has changed a lot since I started work in the mid 1970s in what was then called a Government Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments, charged with 'Preservation'. All of those words now carry connotations which make them more or less unusable, so far has we moved forward with the times.

Can we envisage a different way of approaching heritage? One characterized not by the importance (and thus distance and specialness) of heritage objects, but by their nearness and localness - starting indeed as soon as we step out of our house - by being everywhere and relevant to everyday life, by their usefulness, not only in practical terms, but also in helping to form identities, sense of place, and landscape. Some heritage approaches of the past half-century have hovered around such a definition, notably the area-based approaches to urban conservation and townscape, but even they stop when the suburbs are reached, where the mass of the populations have their lives.

Since at least the 1980s, the preservation of the past has been promoted as an instrument of regeneration and growth. Such an attitude is central to sustainable development, and is becoming more so as culture - people and their concerns and needs - is given its proper place in sustainable development alongside environmental concerns. In Europe, the Council of Europe's Faro Convention "on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society" (hereafter, Faro) gives a glimpse of how such a socially-embedded concept of heritage might work. Faro argues that responsibility towards cultural heritage is not solely the domain of experts, but should be exercised—and indeed in daily life often is, by individuals and by heritage communities, people who share values about specific aspects of cultural heritage to be sustained and transmitted to future generations.

## **2. Current changes**

The context, practice and aims of Heritage are already changing. Not least, 'experts' no longer own the idea of heritage on their own, but share it and negotiate it, increasingly often with people who we might label non-experts, but who are not. We have always said we wanted this to happen, but will the result be what we expected? And then there are the economic and political changes that are creating different, smaller, role for the state.

There are many other changes underway as well -

- The landscape paradigm exerts a major influences (changing, eg. scale, attitudes to change and the balance between outside measures and local context);
- the boundaries of 'heritage' broaden, with more focus on intangible heritage and a realisation that all heritage is intangible because the values we see in it come from us, are attributed not inherent (where does that leave authenticity?);
- societies are becoming more diverse, and so therefore is the idea of heritage; no longer a single national narrative drawn from heritage, the link between heritage and nationality is dissolving;
- the ways of valuing heritage – what is seen as important, and what we should do with it - are becoming very varied and pluralistic, so that the old practice of selecting the best heritage becomes untenable
- 'protection' becomes just one goal, and we see heritage as a cultural and social process not a series of products, about people not only with things (fabric)
- ideas such as those in the Faro Convention on the 'the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society', connected not to saving the past, but to using it and living with it.

New paradigms and thinking are emerging, notably in Europe under the influence of the Florence and Faro conventions of the Council of Europe, approaches, and more internationally through academic research, such as the Association of Critical Heritage Studies (ACHS) network of scholars and researchers working in the broad and interdisciplinary field of heritage studies.

Indeed, your conference programme this week is full of examples of the sort of things I would say are the 'new heritage'. These new ideas are perhaps just a new way of talking about what we have always done, so there is no cause for anxiety about losing ground that has been gained hard-won since (?) the 1960s. The change is well under way.

### **3. The risks of change**

Some of these ideas have been thrown up previously in the past two decades, and not always found a good reception among heritage practitioners and politicians, the former fearing that 'the baby will be thrown out with the bathwater', the latter that heritage is trying to be too sweeping in its reach.

But the baby won't be thrown out with the bathwater; it's grown up a lot and can swim and run now. The Heritage movement has become very successful. We are better equipped these days to protect sites. Well-prepared and well-resourced preservation systems exist in most parts of Europe, for example, often with strong popular support.

So why change? Because the world around us changes. The driving forces for heritage (to counter losses caused by 'development' - belief in progress, disregard for the environment, or lack of understanding) are no longer as strong, the need to 'rescue' not so acute. But instead there are other changes, including some which are creating more public desire for the sort of progress and growth-led

development which gave rise to the conservation movement in the first place. There is, for example, the world's environmental and climate-change problems, its energy deficit, the economic crisis. Perhaps even more fundamentally, there is a shift in the balance between public and private concerns, which arises partly from small government ideologies, partly from globalisation and the still-growing power of the marketplace, and which the economic crisis since 2008 is being used to hide. Government plans to make it easier to carry out development, to meet energy needs, to boost economies out of recession and create unemployment threaten to dismantle our structures for heritage protection. After all, people often still say, despite all the evidence that heritage and conservation helps to create economic wealth and stronger societies, that heritage is obstructing economic growth.

Yet, conversely, the calls for public participation in spatial planning, in heritage, in place-shaping, and the linkage of matters such as landscape and heritage to human rights agendas, and, through sustainability, to social equity, offer a contrary set of changes. Our most successful heritage systems, however, depend on selection using national or specialist measurements carried out by experts, rarely form a fully local perspective. How many times do local requests for the listing of a locally-valued building meet the assertion that it is not a good enough, well-preserved, or authentic, or sufficiently early, example of its type – not one of the best nationally, which is the answer to a different question to the one asked by the applicants. Normally only the best sites benefit from our heritage laws. In contrast, in the Faro Convention perspective of democratically owned and defined heritage, or in the Florence Convention view of landscape being everything and everywhere, things that are not on national lists can be important too. Other factors, apart from changes in the perceived role of experts, such as the “rise of the local”, have helped to turn public attention towards a more democratically defined and “ordinary” heritage, which is increasingly often expressed in terms of ‘place’ or ‘landscape’.

Over the past century, there has been a development in most countries from the ‘rescue’ or ‘save’ “rearguard” instincts to preserve a few threatened buildings or icons, usually late in the day (often too late – the conservation movement in all countries have their symbolic lost buildings, their milestone defeats and occasionally victories), to the relatively well-prepared and resourced preservation mechanisms we see today, driven and reinforced by a systematic social preference for keeping old buildings. Whilst effective, these well-honed methods are stuck in the past insofar as that they grew up in a time when the past seemed beleaguered, that it was a challenge to protect anything at all. Strong protection arose (was allowed by governments to appease?), but it was restricted to a very small proportion of the heritage, that part which politically was conceded to the heritage lobby and whose preservation was affordable. That latter aspect, affordability, became easier as the idea of regeneration, of heritage paying its way, came to take hold, but still it was underpinned by selectivity. We still see major urban redevelopment where one or two buildings or facades are saved, but finish up context-less, in a sea of new buildings, having retained their architectural value but few others of their value (memory, association, place, setting, and so on).

The definition of ‘heritage’ thus came to be equated with what could be afforded on economic grounds. The criteria for being selected were national and expert, external to the context, not local, place-related and contextual. Equally important, in purely numerical terms alone it started to become impossible with the resources available to apply traditional preservationist objectives to the ever larger numbers of buildings we now designate and wish to “protect”. Economically it is not sustainable, socially it may not remain acceptable forever. Changing populations means that what was once valued may not be valued in the future, or may not be the only things valued; “modern” things (the things we often try to prevent being built today) will conversely come to be seen as valued

heritage. It is factors such as these that will drive the evolution of new heritage approaches and attitudes

If there is a frustration with the old heritage measures (designation and the like), however, and a desire to achieve more with new more adventurous approaches, there is also a corresponding fear of weakening the few legal tools we already have to protect heritage and shape places, and of losing the ground that has been hard won since the 1960s (and earlier). Some of that ground, in some countries in Europe, is falling away beneath us, as political and social change brings in governments intent on shrinking the public sphere and expanding the private. Heritage in most countries was traditionally largely the responsibility of the state, either directly through its own care and stewardship mechanisms, or indirectly through regulation. But as the state shrinks back, what happens to the heritage process. The usual answer is that private money – rich people, corporations - will step forward to finance it, but which bits of heritage will they support? And is that not a return to the pre-modern times of patronage? He who pays the piper.... Will funding shifts mean policy / priority shifts?

The grounds of the debate have changed already. The most recent change to heritage legislation in England for example came not in heritage legislation or even in planning legislation but in the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013, in a part of the Act entitled ‘Reduction of Legislative Burdens’; it aims to help business and the private sector, not to protect heritage or other public goods. I think there have been similar Acts in Canada – *the Jobs, Growth and Long-term Prosperity Act, the Jobs and Growth Act* ? Part of English Heritage that looks after 400 of the most important public monuments in the country will become a charity, so that it is freed(notice the language) to raise its funding and support in the private sector.

So like it or not, change seems to be upon us; as I said at the outset, the heritage attitudes, practices and laws we have are not absolute but are products a particular historical moment, even one might say, fashion, and both moment and fashion seem to be changing.

#### **4. The need for change - Us and them?**

Yet nevertheless, now is a time for rethinking what heritage means and what it aims for. In my own experience that involves a broadening-out of horizons through the lens or prism of landscape, not simply as a matter of scenery but as a way for people and communities to share how they see the world, how they interact with their environment, and with each other, and how they shape their future worlds. To claim that the place where heritage, landscape and sustainability meet is where policy and practice can be framed on all social, economic and environmental fronts may seem a little grandiose, but in the last ten years it has been written into two Council of Europe conventions (not European Union statements, so they are exhortatory rather than directive or prescriptive).

We know how to preserve the special places, the architectural masterpieces, and the key archaeological sites which it is politically possible to save. ‘Development’ has found a way to make money from them ( tourism) or to work around them, or to be more positive, has seen positive benefits form a better symbiotic relationship with heritage (regeneration, for example, ideas of resilience within sustainability)

But the special places understandably give an incomplete view of the heritage. We still do not know how to properly treat the wider inheritance from the past – in most cases, the places where most people live. It is not much of a defence to say that those areas are not historic, not old. Whatever

period we use, there is basic flaw in the idea of the rolling cut-off date that is so often used – (25 years? 50 years? 100 years?) – because we know a) that eventually (and these days quite soon) the ‘new’ is seen as ‘old’ and needing protection, b) that it’s too late if we wait until there are a few examples left, and (c), that heritage, being valued, does not depend on age alone, but on context, inter-relationships, associations, memories. Practical and valuable tools for doing this have been used in for decades in ‘town and country planning’ (though with different aims to heritage), conservation areas, district conservation, but they are focussed on special areas, and broader ideas – landscape (in the ELC, ‘everywhere’ sense) and democratic access (social equity) are also needed.

It is perhaps self-evident why people like heritage: because these places are old (they contain memory), significant (they carry associations), beautiful or attractive (though definitions can vary, of course), and familiar (e.g., local). When these ways of valuing a building or a landscape are buttressed by official viewpoints and national criteria, they are reflected in public policy. But public policy does not always reflect local or individual likes (and dislikes), and that is a challenge for a new type of heritage and for participative planning. If heritage champions seek public support for preserving what we see as being the important parts of heritage (as we do), then there is surely another side to the ‘contract’, that we should help the public look after, improve their own neighbourhoods, whether they meet national, expert or established ideas of what is important, even if they do not meet out external criteria (and they are in fact external criteria)

It is also debateable whether the traditional methods of heritage protection are useful in achieving any serious level of social inclusion. Inclusivity cannot easily be built on a process of finding the most important buildings on a national or expert scale and then looking around to see who might feel “ownership” of them, or be educated to do so. Subscribing to a universal, inclusive view of heritage – acting on the recognition that heritage under whatever name has always been a democratic right – may require us to do the opposite, that is to find out what people themselves value, in their local areas, further afield, or even simply in perception or memory (although we should not always unthinkingly privilege the local viewpoint above all others), whether or not those things would ever appear on a national list of the best buildings.

This is not to say that a concern with identifying, valorising and protecting from destruction the best of the archaeological and architectural heritage does not remains fundamentally important. Part of the equation in doing that is to preserve things to keep options (eg future scientific research open to future generations). But it is now difficult to regard it as being enough. New attitudes to heritage and a wider range of social perspectives are starting to require different ways of seeing and revised priorities. ‘The’ Heritage can be seen to be not restricted to ‘that which we wish to pass on’ but to extend to everything we have inherited – to the totality of our inheritance - whether or not we choose to try to pass it on. There are other ways to celebrate and mark heritage than its full physical preservation. Passing on heritage to our successors (‘keeping’ it) is just one way of responding to this inheritance; there are other ways, such as celebrating it as it fades away or as it is transformed, or using it to effect a transformation. This is particularly relevant of course to the more recent parts of the inheritance.

### **5. So ...**

Heritage is much, much wider than we’ve allowed it to be; much wider than designated sites and tourist attractions. It is unavoidable because it everywhere. In the old paradigm, we defined heritage as being be the special out-of-the ordinary buildings or places to which we could imagine applying the goal of protection and preservation, hence the development of our legal tools. In this new way of looking, that is reversed – instead of the select few, we accept that everything we have inherited,

firmly ‘in-the-ordinary’, is being heritage – but we change the goal of heritage from minority protection to majority use, we embed this wider view of heritage in broader social community activity, valuation, and use. This does not mean abandoning protection where it is needed, merely recognition that protection in changing social and cultural is no longer enough (and that perhaps, in a different cultural climate, is not so essential in as many cases). What mainly protects the bulk of pre-1950 houses in the UK, for example, is not heritage law but on the one hand a property market which gives high values to such things and on the other a strong cultural predilection for older houses. That does not apply in all European countries however, nor for that matter in all socio-economic classes in Britain, but where it does not apply heritage laws cannot significantly fill the gap. The sight of a derelict 19<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse is incredibly rare in rural Britain, relatively common in rural France, for example.

The central issue is that future heritage will need to encompass more than protection if it is to remain successful, retain popular support and fulfill its potential in terms of sustainability, social cohesion, the formation of identities and so forth. It needs to accept that heritage is part of daily life, but that our engagement with it is at a cultural level, and extends from protection to adaptation (regeneration for example) through alteration and change to replacement and destruction, commemoration and remembering. And along the way, heritage takes account of custom and other intangible aspects of life, often bound to the material fabric that we have traditionally called heritage. Indeed, it sometimes seems that the best road to a more socially-embedded way of doing heritage is through this notion of intangibility. Most of the values we see in a heritage building are attributed to it by people, they are not intrinsic to the building itself; can we therefore argue that heritage is always intangible, even when that has material form? Sometimes this is summed up by the concept of ‘place’.

In other words, perhaps, start using the word heritage as a verb not a noun – something we do, not merely the things we work with; more importantly, start emphasising even more than we do already that heritage is a people-focused process: people not things come first, the buildings they value follow

Such ideas come from the field of landscape - Landscape, in the European Landscape Convention definition now accepted in policy throughout Europe, as ‘an area of land as perceived by people’ – it is not the land, not the scenery, but what our brains through our senses, memory and cognition construct as the shape of their world. There cannot be any landscape without people to perceive it, there can only be land or environment.

Landscape is also defined by community, by being a common good, the shared resource par excellence, belonging to everyone but owned (unlike land) by no-one.

In the remainder of this talk I will focus in more detail on the following strands which go some way to encompassing the new ideas in heritage:

- a) Landscape
- b) The Value of Cultural Heritage for Society
- c) Cultural and social sustainability,
- d) From protection to managing change
- e) The everyday heritage of ordinary life
- f) Lincoln Townscape Assessment

### **a). Landscape**

The European Landscape Convention (ELC; Council of Europe, 2000) was the first international instrument dealing with the whole landscape. Opened for signature in 2000, it very rapidly attracted

support throughout Europe, indicating perhaps that this was an issue whose moment had come. In 2013 it has been adopted and is in force in 38 of the Council of Europe's 47 member states. This includes all but four of the 27 EU countries, so in theory it should be improving the lives of over 80% of the EU's population.

The Convention promotes 'landscape' as the frame of everyone's daily lives, a tool for working towards sustainable development at all scales, a unifying concept merging nature and culture, and a cross-sectoral imperative that cannot be sidelined into a single policy area.

Landscape is also more complex than it is sometimes taken to be. It is best not to regard it simply as a view, or scenery, something we look at. As the Florence Convention reminds us, 'landscape' is more than that. The beholder (or the thinker and the dreamer, because landscape depends as much on ideas, memory and cognition and as on sight, sound and smell) is just as important as the thing that is beheld. Landscape is a powerful concept precisely because it originates with people. When defined as 'an area as perceived by people' it becomes clear that without people there is, there can be, no landscape at all; the environment exists independently of us but place and landscape only grow out of people's minds and emotions.

- Landscape and heritage should be very closely interwoven. Landscape is wholly a cultural issue, not only in those areas we like to distinguish as 'cultural landscapes', because every landscape is a matter of human perception, an issue of shared common heritage, an important 'frame' through which people view their worlds: in other words, as a way of seamlessly incorporating the historic environment into the future.
- The ELC offers a forward-looking approach to provide the highest quality landscape for future generations not only by protecting special landscapes but by managing and enhancing all landscape .
- The ELC is not exclusively preservationist, but recognises that the essence of landscape is its living, changing character, dynamic both physically and in terms of changing perceptions and opinions.
- Spatial planning and the management of change in general, eg through agri-environmental policy, is likely to be the primary delivery mechanisms for the Convention.

Landscape and heritage are in some senses identical – ways of seeing the world, and defining our relation to it. They are useful ways of seeing because they both link the past with the future, they both people and social interaction at their centre, they both have traction on the environmental challenges that face us so significantly, they both are held out in the Faro and Florence conventions as ways of helping society to pursue sustainable development. The need for new heritage approaches and thinking is not just to protect the gains of the past century, nor to preserve our historic environment – it is because it is the way to ensure that heritage plays the key role that it needs to in politics and society, and cultural activity. Arguably, the self-consciousness of taking the idea of heritage apart from the world, which has arisen since the later 19<sup>th</sup> century, severed heritage's link to ordinary life.

In what follows, I therefore sometimes use the word landscape instead of cultural heritage or heritage because landscape is one of the most common ways in which heritage - the tangible or intangible inheritance from the past - becomes a part of today, everyday, experience and life.

The tenets of the ELC are however difficult to operationalise because of long-established habits of seeing landscape as a sectoral or single-disciplinary issue. Also, in the eyes of policy makers the power and utility of the concept is weakened by contrasting meanings and interpretations in the humanities and the physical sciences. Landscape thus often 'falls between the stools' of different

policy areas. It is also too often treated as a fragile inheritance requiring expert protection rather than as a robust dynamic organism that is continually socially re-constructed, an aspect of human culture. The ELC does this explicitly by asking governments to incorporate landscape policies into all other aspects of law and government policy. Ideally a country will not have a landscaper policy *per se*, but all policies will contribute towards landscape issues, in various ways, at social, demographic, economic, and environmental levels.

Many writers have pointed out that emphasis is “shifting from a definition of landscape as scenery to a notion of landscape as polity and place”, and landscape is much less often now seen as being ‘the same as scenery’, but as ‘a meeting point between people and nature, past and present, and tangible and intangible values’. In many European countries, however, this concept of landscape still lacks strength in legislation and policy. Landscape takes second or third place behind less sophisticated definitions such as nature, ecosystem services, biodiversity or cultural heritage which appear less ambiguous but are also less unifying, more reductionist, less comprehensive and ultimately less socially relevant and of less value to policy, spatial and developmental planning and environmental protection.

How in practice to connect Landscape and Heritage – from my perspective I find this simple; through landscape’s perceptual status and heritage’s intangible aspects, they are more or synonyms; all landscape is inherited and is therefore heritage; history and heritage as crucial components of landscape. Both are cultural constructs. Others find it more difficult, and prefer to keep them separate, and to be honest the ramifications and benefits of the interactions are still being worked out at policy level. A recent (2010) ‘Science Policy Briefing’ for the European Science Foundation called ‘Landscape in a Changing World- Bridging Divides, Integrating disciplines, serving society was written in an interdisciplinary frame but from a strong humanities and historical perspective. A new European network, CHeriScape, will explore this further as well, through a series of five interdisciplinary and international conferences considering landscape as heritage in terms of policy, science (research), community, global change, and imagination and the virtual future

### **b) The Value of Cultural Heritage for Society**

This convention brings broader definitions to the discussions than most of its predecessors. It sees heritage as

- intangible as well as tangible,
- perceptual as well as physical,
- action and performance, custom, behaviour, identity.
- central to ‘real life’, eg economic resource (not just tourism)
- People-centred
- Heritage as process not product

It is also concerned with:

- the ‘why’ not the ‘how’ of heritage
- people and their values, and is less concerned with ‘things’
- heritage’s benefits and uses for society

Earlier documents like Venice, Grenada, and Valetta conventions, and UNESCO, mainly focussed on the fabric of heritage. Faro – and Florence ELC as well - concern people:

- **People-centred** focussed on the (living) people who construct, use and celebrate (or oppose) heritage



- A citizen's **right to heritage** and to participate in cultural life matched by **responsibilities** - individual and collective - to respect and protect the cultural heritage, and the cultural memory, of other groups – 'everyone, alone or collectively, has the responsibility to respect the cultural heritage of others as much as their own heritage'.
- external attributed significance and **plurality of view and uses**;
- heritage and landscape as **constructs**;
- relate to concepts like 'place', landscape, culture or identity ...and ordinary, commonplace things

Possible slide re conflict etc;

In its active sense, heritage is not restricted to "official" actions or laws. It includes the most basic and egalitarian processes of a person's being and becoming in the world. This is why the Faro convention speaks about everyone's right to have their cultural heritage respected and taken into account; it speaks of a sense of belonging and 'ownership' that goes further than mere property rights. That presupposes multiple values and perceptions.

Expert, official or orthodox ways of seeing or valuing heritage remain valid. Of course, there are however multiple and plural ways of seeing and acting. Some of these value systems may not be scientific or objective, but they may still be part of heritage. All that is required is a framework of tolerance and acceptance of diverse viewpoints. This too is the message of Faro. The same heritage may mean different things to different communities, and conversely one community's heritage may not be another's. Binding together all this multiplicity, however, are the concepts of common heritage, of responsibilities towards other people's heritage as well as rights to your own.

Heritage is also seen by the Faro convention as an aspect of human rights, with the responsibility to respect the heritage of others. The same has been claimed for landscape. Heritage is held out as a tool for conflict resolution and reconciliation, instead of being used as a weapon as at times even in the quite recent past. There are also themes in the convention of social equity / social cohesion, the concept of 'Heritage communities' – and of heritage helping to forge community identity, as well as contributing to a common European heritage.

### **Summing up Faro**

Where does Faro' take us? Its underlying ideas are very radical, reading between the lines. What is heritage, what's it for; heritage as action and process with multiple values

Many ideas from this convention, and from its symbiosis with the ELC, have flowed further into the mainstream of thought and practice, changing mindsets and perspectives, signposting the journey towards the new ideas about heritage and society that the Faro Convention promotes.

- we do not mainly preserve the past for its own sake, and not even only to learn about the past, important though that is; rather, the past is important for the part it plays in the present day and in the future.
- seeing heritage not as asset but as a resource, ie not only as something fragile to be kept safe but as something that is quite robust enough to be used constructively, and where necessary modified or changed.
- a big role for the general public as well as for experts; experts might have a facilitating rather than an authoritative role, therefore different types of heritage will be identified

- presaged the focus on landscape and place rather than buildings and fabric that underpins both the Faro and the Florence Conventions.
- heritage might be seen as being broader in scope than it had previously been defined, and that it might be dynamic and constantly changing.
- Most of all, perhaps, the idea is growing that the protection of the authentic fabric of a minority of special monuments and buildings fulfils only a small part of the social potential of heritage.

On the question of participation in heritage, *Faro* speaks of the need ( in the context of heritage as human right and common responsibility)

- to involve *everyone* in society in the ongoing process of defining and managing cultural heritage”, to preserve heritage for explicit and broad social benefit.
- and an asset to encourage social and economic development on the basis of the past .... ensuring its continuity.
- What matters is not only the fabric of buildings, but the memories and associations they contain and the lifeways and social customs they reflect.

Out of participation should come action, and the Faro convention reminds us that ‘Heritage’ is a social and cultural activity as well as an assemblage of ‘stuff’ and buildings’. We may not always realise it, but the word ‘heritage’ is uses a verb as well as a noun. It denotes actions as well as objects, processes as well as products. The very act of preserving heritage creates community, whether the work is ultimately successful or not. As a mere noun, heritage signifies those objects that we worry about preserving, but as a sort of verb, it signifies the process (and philosophy) .of looking after and exploiting those objects. Increasingly, as in Faro, the second, active, sense is becoming central.

Another aspect of both the Florence ELC and the Faro CH conventions is that heritage embraces “everything we have inherited”. At the same time, and partly because of the new breadth and inclusivity, these new ideas about heritage start to change what people think of as the goal of heritage action. Article 2 of the Faro Convention speaks of “resources”, rather than “assets”. Regarding heritage as a resource acknowledges that it exists to be used, and that therefore there are users who will benefit - people, individually or in “heritage communities”. Faro tries to put these people at the centre of debate; so does the Florence Convention – landscape is an area as perceived by people (no people, no landscape, it’s not environment), the goals of landscape management are social – ‘landscape quality objectives, the aspirations of the public for their surroundings, their cadre de vie. This automatically gives heritage broader social value. Sustainability, in fact.

Heritage is obviously about inheritance, but it is also about legacy - not only do we inherit from the past but we bequeath to the future. Our legacy for the future is not only the things from the past that we decide to protect and pass on unchanged, but also all those things from the past that we pass on in modified condition, or perhaps even only as memories, often very powerful. Such dynamism, and change, is a characteristic of landscape. And it is one of landscape’s lessons for heritage. (In fact, as an archaeologist, I personally usually find the modifications that have been made over the generations to buildings, for example, to meet changing historical conditions are at least, and usually more, interesting than the undisturbed original conception of the architect or patron.) This view casts doubt however on the heritage habit of identifying the least changed, most authentic examples for protection. When we look at ‘landscape’ there is – quite simply – no original, authentic form to protect at all. Behind or beneath (I am an archaeologist) every past layer of landscape hides an earlier

one; the present day landscape, the one we live with, includes all its pasts, visible or not. The tension between change and conservation is central to the sustainability challenge. It's about past and future and future finding reconciliation in the present day, again about sustainability

**c). Sustainability: cultural and social as well as environmental and ecological**

Sustainability is one of the strong foundations of the Faro Convention on the value of cultural heritage *for society*, and of the ELC. Faro promotes the democratisation and inclusivity of cultural heritage which makes a vital contribution to identity and social cohesion, as will we hear later. But an equally important message that can be drawn from Faro is that sustainability itself is cultural and social, not merely a process for environmental protection or a vehicle for green politics. Sustainability concerns the relationship of people with the world. It touches on how people live (and life-ways or lifestyle are crucial to landscape constructions as well), on people-based issues such as quality of life, on place-based issues such as *cadre de vie* or landscape, on society and social responsibilities as well as on rights, and of how we can adapt to change.

An early exploration of what sustainability meant to heritage was the short leaflet developed in the middle of the 1990s (and published by English Heritage in 1997) called *Sustaining the Historic Environment*. Beginning in 1993 as an early attempt to jump on the bandwagon of sustainable development, it rapidly became a mirror which reflected of our thoughts and attitudes back to us in new ways. *Sustaining the Historic Environment* did not change the world overnight. Not everyone agreed with it. Perhaps its challenges were too great. Some of its ideas were met with some scepticism, or were seen as a distraction from long-established priorities to save the best buildings or as a threat to established approaches – ‘we cannot afford to protect everything’. But attitudes and ideas generally change quite slowly and the great point about sustainability is that it is a long-term process.

Many of the leaflet's ideas – and others – came to the fore again in the year 2000, during the year-long participative review that radically re-examined the purpose and nature of heritage in England, and produced the document ‘*Power of Place*’. They drew some of the same reactions, as does Faro now; but still these new ideas gain ground.

We might pause briefly as well to consider the current interest in cultural sustainability, recognising that while the need for more sustainable approaches might arise from environmental and ecological problems, the solutions – perhaps like the causes – need to be cultural, not least in terms of helping people visualise the need and reasons for changed patterns of behaviours, but also for starting to achieve those. We can't ignore the fact that we live in a cultural ecosystem, and society and politics are cultural constructs just as much as landscape and heritage. Heritage is most definitely an aspect of culture. One project investigating this area is a European network of researchers under the banner of a COST Action, ‘Investigating Cultural Sustainability’. It has almost a hundred participants at present, from many disciplines and 24 European countries (and Australia and New Zealand), and aims through workshops, conferences, researcher exchange, training schools and writing to increase the understanding of the meaning and role of culture in Sustainable Development, based on multidisciplinary principles and approaches. Heritage (and landscape) is one of its four spheres of thinking, but also suffuses the rest through issues such as identity and place, human nature interfaces, and politics. Currently, it seems, heritage is often thought of as a conservative approach to sustainability, and not necessarily linked to place, other forms of culture, diversity and identity. In this new project however, it is explored as a part of cultural activity, thus opening another way for heritage to achieve its social benefit.

#### **d). From Protection to Managing Change**

A truly sustainable goal for heritage might be the management of change everywhere, with the idea of the character of place being as important as the fabric of monuments. This does not mean necessarily full-scale protection and retention of all monuments, nor the building of virtual fences around special places. Instead, this approach involves a process of social negotiation about change in the context of wider spatial planning policies

An example of the new approach is involvement in regional level strategic planning of the large territories defined (prior to 2008) as ‘Growth Areas’ at the edges of both historic cities such as Norwich and modern ones such as Milton Keynes; or in nodal points such as the Thames Gateway, or in corridors such as the Thames valley and the “M11 corridor” between London - Stansted airport - Cambridge. The old approach relied on existing official lists of (nationally) special places to tell developers what to avoid or treat carefully, essentially a constraining, negative approach to large scale forward planning. The new approach looks with a fresh eye at the whole area of a development (and its surroundings) and identifies what is culturally valued for one reason another, whether recent or older, that might influence the shape or appearance of the future development, and that might be used to make new places better – that is, more sustainable, with a legible and more enjoyable history, and with new development reflecting better the inherited pattern rather than struggling against the flow of history. We live in the past because we are an old culture; we do not have to keep everything but everything that what we have inherited might usefully and explicitly shape what we do.

#### **e). The everyday heritage of ordinary life - place**

Among the factors that are encouraging new approaches to heritage, is what might be termed the “rise of the local”, which has helped to undermine the focus on nationally certificated heritage; a change in attitudes to experts and authority, and the reciprocal change in the perceived role of experts; the growth of concern for green issues and confusion between them and heritage; and the impact of sustainable development. All these have helped to turn public attention away from the special heritage identified by national experts towards a more democratically defined and “ordinary” heritage. With this has come a need for different methods because not everything can be kept unchanged.

It seems increasingly important to contextualise heritage protection more widely by paying attention to how the whole of the historic environment fits into contemporary life, and how the past is actually always part of the present. This involves working through the spatial planning process as well as the listed building system, or indeed instead of it. We often encapsulate these attitudes in the term ‘characterisation’ – a way of trying to seeing ‘heritage’ as part of a much wider whole that lies at the base of socially-relevant issues such as identity and quality of place. It is now a truism that the concept of place connects people to their surroundings (that is, their landscape). I would also say however that it serves to connect people with each other. Place thus has very significant social and political virtues, on which the Faro convention capitalises. In some ways, however, ‘place’ and ‘landscape’ are being used in the same way that since the end of the 1980s we have used the word sustainability. To emphasise the connection rather than the separation of past and future. A shorthand for the contemporary social relevance of the past. Another way of working with heritage.

Many of the photographs you are seeing during this talk are of Lincoln, a small town of about 100,000 people (‘city’ by virtue of its splendid cathedral) in the East Midlands of England. They illustrate the ‘ordinary importance’ of heritage in its place. I hope they encapsulate without extra words much of what I want to say. They come from the results of an EH project carried out by EH and the City of

Lincoln (notably by David Walsh and Adam Partington in creating the Lincoln Townscape Assessment). It formed a part of a large national programme carried out by English Heritage and local authorities under the general banner of ‘characterisation’, usually ‘Historic landscape characterisation’, and a few minutes speaking about the background and principles might be useful. It is one of the fields in which the landscape idea has interacted most successfully with heritage, indeed where heritage as landscape has been explored in an active, real world context closely tied to spatial planning, conservation and development control. It is carried out at various scales, but the common factors are an area-based, generalising approach that locates inherited remains – traces of our past, memories of our predecessors – in the present day context.

3 Slides – mosaic of HLCs – GLC – Hackney:

A large part of what shapes places and landscapes is of commonplace or everyday significance. Such things will not reach the national lists and registers of protected or classified buildings, and indeed we might say that they should not. This is ‘neighbourhood’ heritage, as we might well call it, often local, small scale, non-monumental - mundane things that are given value by familiarity and ‘their fit’ into their locality, and that need different treatment. Their values are often intangible, associative ones, not the values attributed by criteria based on architectural quality. These ‘ordinary’ things are often not buildings but other types of components of the historic environment – walls, pavements or fences and gates, for example, or even tracks and roads, not to mention ‘simply’ associations or memories. One example is the survival in vestigial, almost symbolic form of the pre-urban, pre-industrial landscape beneath our major cities. Once noticed, it is an observation that can change people’s perception – and thus their mental landscape – of the places where they live; this touches on identity as well, as re-examining how people and places are perceived..

3 Slides - Anfield etc – big screen – Black Country:

We can respond to inheritance in many different ways. A sustainable heritage is one that forms part of social and economic life, not one that is protected outside the mainstream. Not all heritage will be kept unchanged, and we may keep parts or aspects only, or we might keep it in terms of memory, as place names or patterns in new townscape. Relics of the past tell us that the past was sometimes different, but they also tell us that the future will be different. They also explain the present in which we live, whether we choose to call that process heritage, place, townscape or landscape

#### **f). Landscape in Lincoln – the LTA**

I’ve been showing a lot of photographs of a town called Lincoln in the English ‘East Midlands’. It is small, with a permanent population of about 100,000, and an area of about c 35sq km), but it was home to an experimental project carried out over the past decade put some of these ideas, and those of landscape characterisation, into practice. Lincoln had a well developed and effective heritage service closely associated with its spatial planning functions, and had a long tradition of townscape conservation. It is an important tourist place, with remains of its Roman city, its medieval castle, cathedral and medieval to 19<sup>th</sup> century town centre. But still it was felt that heritage, especially in the outlying areas where most residents lived, were slipping through the net; that the touristy parts were OK, but the rest was being overlooked.

The Lincoln Townscape Assessment therefore took into its scope the whole of the city, up to the most recently built residential areas at the perimeter. The city was divided into 108 ‘neighbourhoods’ (character areas) each defined by a distinctive character derived from its archaeology, its history, its architecture and most of all its urban landscape – the experience of being in that particular place, taking into account open space, the ‘feel’ of the streets, architecture etc. – the intangibles, if you like.

(Admittedly, despite some focus group engagement with local residents, this remained primarily an expert perspective, although one aiming to encapsulate everyday experience).

In this project we looked at most of the aspects I've been talking about, from a way of seeing and looking at the whole of a town – a landscape, if you like, perhaps from an expert viewpoint but one which tried to place itself in a resident's shoes, to a way of creating a new participative type of planning and management tool. Developers wishing to obtain consents to build new buildings in Lincoln are directed as a first step to the Lincoln Townscape assessment; they need not follow it slavishly (it does not have prescriptions, it is not a design code) but they are asked to show how it has informed their new design, either as inspiration or as counterpoint. In some cases, suggested designs are rejected for being too conservative, because the mixed character of some areas require further diversity or boldness for example.

We examine and mapped aspects of the street pattern and ways of moving through the city; we looked at evidence for the survival of the landscape below the town, its time-depth. Each neighbourhood has its detailed description of architectural styles, building materials, historical associations, below ground archaeology, ecology, vistas and viewpoints

The whole of this, with historic maps, photographs and videos is available on the city's web page and to mobile phone users, and there is opportunity to add comments, memories, information.

Finally, there are publications, both on the web, (a methodology report and a first assessment of how the project's results are being used – in a town which already had one of the best track records of intelligent and effective heritage conservation - assessment has been and can further be used in design and planning decisions.

### **The uses of heritage (and landscape, place)**

We might end by considering heritage, landscape and place in relation to four very broad and topical global challenges – social, demographic, economic and environmental. This takes us, and the heritage debate, very far from the paradigm of protecting heritage 'for its own' sake or even the use of heritage to shape high quality places to live, or to support urban regeneration. It attempts to mainstream heritage and its related concepts

**Social** issues: people's quality of life and community identities, to which 'place' and therefore both heritage and landscape make a key contribution. Conventional 'Heritage' might be what people go on holiday to see, but Place and Landscape are where they live their lives, or sit in their memories to link them to autobiographical and community pasts, or set the stage for future ambitions and aspirations.

**Demographic** issues, such as migration and its effects, are important. People carry their heritage with them, in memory if not physically; to adapt they will sometimes share it on arrival, and they will find and make new heritage in their new homes. European heritage exists on other continents. People on other continents have heritage in Europe. Globalisation of one sort or another has given all of us heritage and landscape in every continent, wherever we live. Government definitions of heritage are poorly fitted to such fluid and ever-changing circumstances.

**Economic** aspects of heritage are far from restricted to tourism. Heritage contributes broadly to the economy in the same way as society's other fundamental resources such as land, people or raw materials. It stands in the very mainstream of economic activity. High quality of place attracts business, employment, people; good quality landscapes which for many people means those with strong historic and cultural dimensions, support successful economies.

*Environmental* issues include the unavoidable truth, as others have said, that life is lived amongst what was made before. We do not have a natural environment but a highly humanised, artificial, modified one; furthermore, the main ways that people view the environment and construct their mental landscapes .is cultural and social, not environmental. Solutions to environmental problems have to be social solutions as well.

Ultimately, heritage is alive and dynamic. Sometimes it is necessary to deal with special buildings as artefacts, lifted from the turmoil of everyday life, but that is a small part of what heritage should be offering. The wider view of the Faro Convention, and its reference to human rights and social equity, , and the opportunity that landscape ideas through the ELC give to make heritage of daily relevance – the historic environment begins when you step out of your house in the morning – provides a much bigger stage for heritage action. The framework of cultural sustainability provides the frame for that action, connecting us not only to the past but to the present day challenges that are so near the top of the political agendas. Heritage also speaks to the economic crisis through these ideas, too. They offer heritage a renewed and enlarged relevance.