This is an author produced version of a paper published in
Landscape Research.
This paper has been peer-reviewed and is proof-corrected, but does not
include the journal pagination.

Integrating Landscape Values in Landscape Character Assessment; the Hidden Dominance of the Objective Outsider.

ANDREW BUTLER.
Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala, Sweden.

ABSTRACT *While there has been extensive research undertaken on the values which insiders attribute to landscape there is a lack of literature which looks at how planning professionals handle landscape values. In this article I develop a framework for questioning how landscape values are taken up in landscape planning, with the aim of conceptualising what landscape values mean in practice. This is undertaken through addressing landscape assessment, more specifically analysing how landscape character assessment (LCA) which represents a critical point in the framing of landscape values. Through a synthesis of research on landscape values I examine the underlying logic of the LCA documents. I conclude that the values communicated in these assessments tend to be those of "objective" outside experts, predominantly based on aesthetics and focusing on the physicality of landscape. This I argue leads to a questioning the legitimacy of the LCA approach.*

KEY WORDS: Landscape values, Landscape Character Assessment, objective outsider

Introduction

Landscape planning is largely concerned with negotiating multiple landscape values through place making and conflict management. Within these activities certain values are accepted while others are marginalised or ignored (Stephenson, 2010), thereby privileging the holder of those values which are legitimised in the planning process. Values which are recognised and legitimised are drawn on to motivate change or determine accepted usage of the landscape (Holstein, 1998), ultimately defining for whom the landscape is planned (Thompson, 2000). The landscape values which are legitimised in the planning process become evident at the assessment stage when the landscape is framed. It is usually at this stage that the values of the inhabitants who directly experience the landscape *can* be included, informing how landscape is recognised and shaping how landscape is handled in the planning process. While attempts have been made to engage with the values of inhabitants it is evident that these values often do not inform the early stage of the landscape planning process. A challenge for research is to understand the dynamics of values handled by landscape planners when engaging the public in the assessment process. In this study I analyse how assessment tools used by landscape planners ('objective' outsiders) include the landscapes values which are held by the inhabitants

Correspondence Address: Andrew Butler, Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Ulls Väg 28, Uppsala SE 750 07, Sweden. Email: andrew.butler@slu.se

(insiders); how diverse and potentially conflicting values are handled by professionals in landscape character assessments.

Values in landscape have been studied by numerous researchers in a variety of contexts: Greg Brown and colleagues have, for example, undertaken extensive work in defining landscape values for participatory mapping (Brown, 2004; Brown and Raymond, 2007; Brown and Raymond, 2014); Michael Jones has developed a categorisation of values for addressing conflicts in planning issues (Jones, 1993; Jones, 2009); and Janet Stephenson has exposed how different forms of assessments take up certain landscape values, whilst ignoring others (Stephenson, 2008; 2010). Building on these scholarly works, I will in this paper I will complement this theorisation of landscape values by examining how professionals recognise and handle multiple values in practice.

The significance of landscape as a policy topic, and thus the values which are intrinsic in the landscape, has been reinforced over the past decade with the adoption of the European Landscape Convention (ELC) (Jones and Stenseke, 2011; Roe, 2013; Scott, 2011). The convention represents the first official international endeavour for defining the substantive nature of landscape within landscape planning. In the ELC landscape is recognised 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: Article1a).

Within the convention, landscape is seen as central to everyday life, as "an essential component of people's surroundings" (Council of Europe, 2000: article 5a). As such landscape represents the most general and publicly accessible source for understanding a culture's past and future (Küchler, 1993); acting both as a bearer and shaper of the values which a society projects onto it. Landscapes are encountered by a multitude of groups and individuals with their own value systems, therefore landscapes are valued in multiple ways (Howard, 2013; Meinig, 1979; Penning-Rowsell, 1986). The significance of landscape for carrying societal values means that changes to the physicality and usage of the landscape affect how it is perceived and the values attached, and thus how individuals and society relate to it.

The turn within practice and policy towards landscape as vessel for and shaper of everyday life mirrors a conceptualisation evident in academia. This is expressed through the European Science Foundation (ESF) and COST science policy briefing, *Landscape in a Changing World*:

> *"… a common good that visibly and invisibly frames everyday lives, helps to shape the world within us as well as around us, and contributes to meeting significant economic and environmental challenges."* (Bloemers, Daniels, Fairclough, Pedroli and Stiles, 2010, p. 2)

Depicting landscape as being reliant on how individuals and society perceive their everyday surroundings, shifts the emphasis of landscape away from what was previously a sectoral interest

towards the recognition of landscape as a holistic and democratic concern (Sarlöv Herlin, 2007). All are experts on their own landscape.

Despite this rhetoric, the majority of landscape research focuses on supposed objective and scientific landscape values to which the general public have no immediate relation (Bergeron, Paquette and Poullaouec-Gonidec, 2014; Conrad, Christie and Fazey, 2011; van der Brink and Bruns, 2012). A similar situation exists in landscape planning practice where decisions are based on professional's outsider based values missing the intimacy and subjectivity of the insiders who directly experience the landscape (Butler and Berglund, 2014; Conrad, Cassar, Jones, Eiter, Izaovičová, Barankova, Christie and Fazey, 2011). This is made evident in the increasingly sophisticated approaches landscape modelling which remain disconnected from social realities (Ryan, 2011).

In this paper I focus on the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) approach as a means of examining how landscape values are handled in practice. I do this through analysing completed assessments which have been undertaken with the inclusion of public engagement. I start by undertaking a theoretical ground clearing of landscape values as a means to develop a framework for analysing the underlying logic of landscape description statements in the assessment documents and the values on which these build. I focus on how the LCA approach addresses multiple values; examining how values are framed in the guidelines to the approach, before analysing specific assessments in order to understand how landscape values incorporated into the assessments. Finally, I discuss the findings of the study in light of the theoretical understanding developed in the early section of the paper.

Values

Values commonly tend to be recognised as being to a greater or lesser degrees objective or subjective. An "objective" conceptualisation of values recognises that there is something intrinsic in the object, while a subjective view point sees that values are projected on to the object by the perceiver and that the entity has no value on its own (Holstein, 1998). In the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) the majority of entries relate to material worth, or the specifics of values to a particular topic (music, mathematics, arts and phonetics), considered objective values. However the first entry of the OED is: *"Relative status of a thing or the estimate in which it is held according to its real or supposed worth, usefulness, or importance"*. This definition expresses the subjectivity of values, '*...supposed worth*' moves away from intrinsic values, which are embedded and predefined, to the supposition that something may have a value reliant on a given situation. Stating that values are 'held' requires a person or discipline etc. to hold them. Similarly, 'usefulness' is reliant on the user to convey values. Another definition, which is presented in the Dictionary of Human Geography recognises values as: *"The principles or standards informing individual or group ideas and beliefs"* (Gregory, Johnston, Pratt, Watt and Whatmore, 2009). These two definitions consequently points to the value an entity is

recognised as holding as being reliant on the personal values of those engaging with it (Brown, Reed and Harris, 2002).

Landscape values

The emphasis on landscape as an everyday, perceived entity, means that the understanding of a specific landscape is dependent on those who engage or experience that landscape. This results in multiple, subjective understandings of the same landscape. An entity dependent on subjectivity means that values relating to it can hardly be intrinsic or inherent as defined above. The values do not speak for themselves, but can only be identified when they are expressed by those who are part of the cultural context, or are in a position to understand it (Stephenson, 2005); those who recognise the specific world view.

If landscape values are seen as being subjective then they are reliant on more than just the physicality of landscape. To recognise just the physicality is recognising no more than a spatial entity, an area as a neutral vessel in which activities occur. A more encompassing understanding of landscape is frequently expressed by a tripartite of aspects, founded on: physicality, relationships and practices. (Stephenson, 2008; Terkenli, 2001; Tress and Tress, 2001; Whiston-Spirn, 2000). This tripartite relates landscape to the extrinsic values linked to the activities undertaken in the landscape and the associations established with and within the landscape (Brunetta and Voghera, 2008; Stephenson, 2008), resulting in a mosaic of diverse and potentially conflicting values spread across the landscape.

How an individual perceives a landscape is dependent on a multitude of factors. The British geographer, Peter Howard (2013) sees that these factors are far reaching, including: religion, social structure, gender, age, experience, insiderness, profession, activity, and the purpose of the gaze. Accordingly individuals and groups bring their own experiences, ideologies and history with them when engaging with landscape issues resulting in differences arising over what values are recognised in the landscape (Eiter, 2010; Jones, 2009; Pedroli, Van Elsen and Van Mansvelt, 2007). For example a farmer's values of the landscape differ from those of a local urbanised population, whose values in turn differs from a tourist's, or the values which a professional undertaking an assessment may attribute to the same landscape. This diversity means that landscape values are dependent on how individuals and groups relate to and project ideals and beliefs on to their surroundings (Jones, 1993; Jones, 2009). It follows that landscape values are created out of the cultural contexts of a time and place, and interpreted through social and cultural filters (Stephenson, 2008). As such values are infused with earlier experiences (Tuan, 1977), which are projected on to the object by the perceiving subject (Planchat-Héry, 2011). Such complexity develops a multiplicity of diverse and potentially conflicting values which individuals and communities express (Stephenson, 2008).

Temporality is also a constitutive aspect of landscape and thus landscape values. Value systems change and become more complex through extended relationships with the landscape, as values become embedded (Relph, 1976; Stephenson, 2008; 2010). Consequently even if the physicality of the landscape remains the same, the values which individuals or groups attach to it will alter. For an individual this could represent either enhanced attachment to a place (Altman and Low, 1992) or conversely "landscape induced alienation" (Arnesen, 1998). While for a community this could be when society's values alter in relation to increased connectivity resulting in perceived compression of space (Castells, 1997); or significant cultural changes in landscape appreciation such as the romanticism of mountain and coastal landscapes in the 18th century or the urban life values of the rural population. As societies acceptance alters it is not only values in landscape which changes but also the standards by which these values are judged (Muir, 1999). Thus while values themselves may be relatively stable, how they are drawn on is dynamic dependent on the issue at hand. Temporality also affects at a micro level with multiple variables influencing the individual's perception and thus what values are recognised, these include; routine, weather, fatigue, time of day (Geelmuyden and Fiskevold, 2013).

In drawing on their ideals and beliefs, individuals tap in to collective meanings providing the framework on which cultural values are constructed (Strang, 1997); shared values which are subsequently given legitimacy within their community through relationships in everyday life (Jones, 2009; Stephenson, 2008). As a result those inhabiting a place with a similar social context develops associations which provide shared ways of perceiving and communicating their landscape (Paasi, 2002), requiring a constant negotiation between self and society.

Values in landscape character assessments

Landscape assessment is the stage in landscape planning where the landscape is framed and values are identified in order to inform future development, management or preservation of landscape. Values ignored or subordinated at this early stage struggle to be recognised in the decision making process. This makes the assessment stage a critical moment for addressing how landscape values are framed in planning. In this study Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), which is increasingly becoming the dominant form of landscape assessment (Jensen, 2006), has been used as a case for analysing how landscape values are included in the assessment phase. More specifically I have examined landscape character assessments from England as the approach which developed in England and Scotland and there is wealth of material from which to draw. Through this section I will explore how the LCA approach engages with landscape values.

In order to understand the values which LCAs engages with initially requires an understanding of how landscape is recognised in the approach, revealing the substantive theory on which the approach is based. LCA is promoted in England through the governmental advisory body *Natural England*. This

organisation has its roots in the National Parks Commission (NPC) of the 1940's, which had the remit; to protect 'outstanding' landscapes through designation. The NPC developed into the Countryside Commission (CC), with an expanded remit to develop access to the countryside. The focused of both the NPC and CC was on landscape as a visual phenomenon with emphasis on the preservation of a rural idyll. This understanding of landscape was reflected in the approaches used to assess the landscape (*Landscape Evaluation* and *Landscape Assessment*), which were based on aesthetic principles (Jensen, 2006).

The LCA guidelines, published in 2002 and still the most current, built on best practice from the previous decade (Swanwick and Land Use Consultants, 2002). In these guidelines there is a marked shift in how landscape is conceptualised, recognising the centrality of those who directly experience it and their interactions and associations with it rather than just the aesthetic qualities:

> *"…relationship between people and place. It provides the setting for our day-to-day lives …a small patch of urban wasteland as much as a mountain range … It results from the way that different components of our environment …interact together and are perceived by us… This is not just about visual perception… but also how we hear, smell and feel our surroundings, and the feelings, memories or associations that they evoke."* (Swanwick and Land Use Consultants, 2002, pp. 2-3)

This definition moves away from the earlier understanding of landscape assessments as being a professional, aesthetic and objective representation. It recognises that in order to assess landscape there is a need to understand how it is perceived; dependent on feelings, associations, relationships and interactions. In this conceptualisation landscape is no longer just something objectively out there, but is recognised as the setting for every-day life, bringing into focus the practices which occur in the landscape (de Certeau, 1984). This broader conceptualisation expands the discussion of which values are relevant in a landscape and thus what can be included in the landscape assessment.

The appreciation that landscape is founded on multiple values is reinforced by how values are recognised in the guidelines:

> *"…landscape may be valued by different communities of interest for many different reasons without any formal designation, recognising, for example, perceptual aspects such as scenic beauty, tranquillity or wildness; special cultural associations; the influence and presence of other conservation interests; or the existence of a consensus about importance, either nationally or locally."* (Swanwick and Land Use Consultants, 2002, p. 55)

The LCA approach comprises of two parts, characterisation and judgement making. According to the LCA guidelines, characterisation should be represented primarily through a written description providing a supposedly objective and value-free basis for making judgement.

"Subjective value judgements should be avoided and a distinction drawn between adjectives which seek to convey the aesthetic qualities of a landscape and those which deal with personal perceptions or values. So, words like bland, beautiful, attractive, degraded and ordinary should generally not be used since such judgements tend to be very subjective and 'in the eye of the beholder'". (Swanwick and Land Use Consultants, 2002, pp 44-45)

This distinction between objectivity and subjectivity is an over simplification. Such a view typically equates objectivity to accuracy, representativeness and impartiality, with subjectivity linked to approximation, idiosyncrasy and bias. Yet as Colin Price (2013) emphasises; a statement can draw on a combination of these adjectives. For example a statement can be objective, approximate and idiosyncratic, e.g. I watch birds here quite often; or they can be subjective, approximate and representative, e.g. Everyone agrees this is the best area for watching birds. This points to a blurring of the boundaries of what is recognised as a subjective statement and thus what is seen as acceptable to represent in an LCA description of the landscape.

Descriptions of landscape, expressed in the assessments, are read as value statements. The descriptions are based on defined values whether acknowledged formally, through identifying the values which are included, or informal without recognition of what is included and excluded. The statement forms an essential component of future rational decision making processes (Lockwood, 1997). However a description does not directly express values, but is read through different values; how one interprets the statement. Therefore in order to make decisions based on descriptions, there needs to be an understand of the premise which lies behind the description, how the statement was framed (Ariansen, 1993; Holstein, 1998).

It is the descriptive representation of landscape as the basis for decision making which is the focus of this study. The rhetoric of the assessment guidance starts to provide an understanding of the value systems in which the LCAs are created. However in order to address how landscape values are operationalised, the individual documents which communicate these values need to be examined. In the following I develop a theoretical framework for exposing the values which underpin the landscape assessment.

Method

The LCAs examined in this study are assessments identified from an earlier study (Butler and Åkerskog, 2014). These assessments recognise landscape as "*…a perceived entity by people…*" and appear to operationalise landscape in such a way through involvement of the public. Ten assessments were identified from the period 2007-2012. Initially the assessment documents were studied in order to understand the context in which they were operating, and how they addressed landscape. This was

undertaken as a means for identifying how landscape was framed and thus what landscape values could potentially be recognised. Following on from this, using a framework which is explained below, the assessments were analysed to understand their underlying logic; what landscape values are actually included, what they build on and whose values are represented. Thus exposing the relationship between rhetoric developed through the ELC and the LCA and practice.

The initial study addressed all ten assessments in order to gain a broad understanding of how landscape values are handled. However a more detailed investigation of the Peak District LCA was undertaken in order to examine more thoroughly the values included in a specific assessments. The Peak District LCA was chosen as it was identified as best practice in this study in accordance with the framework developed within this research.

Landscape value typologies

Typology one

Numerous typologies of landscape values have been devised for example; Holstein, in relation to agricultural landscapes (1998); Brown through work on place attachment (2004); Jones while addressing planning conflicts (2009); and Davenport and Anderson in connection to place meaning (2005). Each of these categorisations differs in their grouping and their level of detail, yet commonalities are evident across the studies. These studies have been drawn upon and synthesised in order to create a framework for addressing the LCAs in this research - see table 1. The categories of landscape drawn from these other studies and utilised in this research are; economic, including subsistence and market value economics; natural significance including diversity and aspect of wilderness; aesthetic and scenic; recreation which covers both active and passive recreational enjoyment; cultural significance including aspects of identity, learning as well as historic elements; and intrinsic aspects, relating to spirituality and sense of place. Not all aspects from other typologies studied were included, for example; security (Jones, 2009), future (Brown, 2004) and family & community (Davenport and Anderson, 2005) were excluded as they either have a narrow focus or not landscape related.

It is recognise that these typologies of values are not exclusive. However these aspects do raise the notion of diversity of values and the idea that those values not recognised and accepted will be ignored.

Table 1. Synthesis of landscape value typologies developed from previous studies.

Typology two

Understanding the typology of the values goes only part way to realising the values which are communicated through the assessments. In order to unearth the logic of these documents there is also a need to recognise whose values are being acknowledged in the assessment. In this study I modified

Edward Relph's (1976) categorisation of insiderness of place as a useful means of distinguishing different broad groups of value holders. The categories used in this study range from the objective outsider who recognises the landscape purely as a space filled with elements rather than experiences; to the existential insider, for whom the landscape is part of them and they are a part of that landscape. The categorisation, presented in table 2, addresses those categories which are relevant for addressing the assessments, therefore the category of existential outsider has been removed as this related to those who choose to not to have attachment to the place. While the categories appear clearly defined in this table there is continuity and fuzziness between the states of insiderness.

Table 2. Categories for value holders after Relph (1976).

Typology three

A third categorisation is used in this study in order to unearth the aspect of landscape these values relate to. This categorisation, *basis of values*, takes up the tripartite facets of landscape examined earlier in the theoretical section of; form, practice and relationship (Stephenson, 2008; 2010; Terkenli, 2001; Tress and Tress, 2001; Whiston-Spirn, 2000). The examination of aspects of landscape was undertaken only for the Peak District LCA case, as this assessment appeared to provide the capacity for capturing a wide array of values.

Results

Recognition of landscape in the assessments.

Although landscape was recognised as a perceived entity in all 10 assessments, there was broad variation in the complexity of definition. These variations ranged from those which reiterated the ELC definition, without obvious further reflection e.g. King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council and Teignbridge district LCA; to others where the ELC had been reflected on and expanded on it, e.g. East Lindsey District and Boston Borough (both undertaken by the same consultant) where landscape is defined as:

> *"…the physical form, visual appearance and also the experience of those living in and moving through the landscape."*

And a third group where the relevance of landscape as a perceived entity was reflected on, along with its relevance for engagement with landscape issues. For example in the Peak District LCA:

> *"Landscape is more than just 'the view'. It is about the relationship between people, place and nature. It is the ever-changing backdrop to our daily lives… Landscape results from the way that different components of our environment – both natural and cultural – interact together and are perceived by us. People value landscape for many different reasons. It is therefore*

important to understand what the landscape is like today, how it came to be like that and how it may change in the future."

All of these definitions provide the opportunity for a space to develop for questioning the multiplicity of values, including those of insiders. They go beyond the visual and physical recognising the relevance of perceiving. However, the Peak district example also acknowledging the significance of *relationships* and *interactions* as well as *practices* through the acceptance of the everyday, highlights the different ways people value landscape. Such a description appears to open up for a wide variety of values (Jones, 2009), multiple sources of values (Stephenson, 2008) and diversity of evaluators (Howard, 2013) with different degrees of insiderness (Relph, 1976).

Landscape values in the assessment

The definition of landscape provides an understanding of the frame in which the assessment is operating. However the significance of the assessment document for planning is in how the individual landscapes are communicated and what values can be gleaned from the descriptions. This is presented in table 3

Table 3. Results from study of LCAs showing categories of values and value holders. The size of the X represents the significance of the values to the assessment.

As table 3 shows, there is significant dominance of the scenic and aesthetic in the landscape description. It also becomes clear that natural and cultural values are also mainstays within most of these assessments, albeit to varying degrees. While other values, such as, economic and recreational are subordinated, having only minimal recognition across the assessments.

The lack of reference to economic and recreational values is especially evident in a landscape assessment such as the Lake District LCA. This represents the UK's largest national park, yet does not relate the economic or recreation values of the landscape, even though tourism and agriculture are significant factors and drivers of landscape change.

The emphasis on the visual influences how other values are handled, with non-visual values frequently being reduced down to a surface representation of those values. An example of this is the description of forestry in the Dartmoor National Park LCA:

> *"...large conifer plantations create dark blocks with hard edges, contracting with the smooth muted landscape backdrop"* (Dartmoor National Park LCA)

This reduces the biodiversity, the economic values for the forester and local economy as well as the cultural significance of the forest to a visual surface ignoring the forces for change which impact on this landscape element. The same holds true with agricultural practices where livestock rearing is reduced to a scenic element:

> *"Free-roaming sheep, cattle and ponies are strongly associated with the moorland scene."*
> (Dartmoor National Park LCA)

Another example is the reduction of recreation to a visual description of the physicality, thus a golf course becomes a visual detractor rather than a place in which experiences occur:

> *"To the North, a golf course (with associated mown grassland) exerts a visible human influence and dominates the character within this section."* (Kings Lynn)

The reliance on the visual to explain non-visual values in the landscape is evident in all assessments to varying extents. Yet it does not just represent an aesthetic understanding of the landscape, it depicts a predominantly objective outsider view of this landscape; landscape as a backdrop or a scene, viewed at a certain moment.

Exceptions to this are Kings Lynn and Peak district assessment which were identified as addressing *incidental outsiders'* values.

> *"The flat to gently rolling landform of this character area is covered with a rich, colourful (with seasonal differences) patchwork of arable farmland, historic parkland (often grazed) and rough grassland, interspersed with (both regular and irregular shaped) copses and belts of plantation woodland (deciduous, coniferous and mixed) and a scattering of hamlets and small villages. Occasional ponds and pools are peppered throughout the area."* (Kings Lynn LCA).

This assessment represented what could be observed through frequent exposure to the landscape; small details and temporal dimensions of the landscape through the year. Yet this still describes an understanding removed from place; landscape as a backdrop or vessel for activities

Peak District Landscape Character Assessment

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the logic within the assessments a more in depth study was made of the Peak District LCA. As outlined earlier this assessment represented best practice within the study. The Peak District LCA forms the landscape knowledge base for a European Landscape Convention Action Plan which was commended in the UK landscape awards for forwarding the European landscape convention.

The Peak District LCA divides the 1 437 km^2 Peak District national park into 8 distinct landscape character areas, which were in turn sub-divided into landscape character types. For each of the character areas the description is divided up in to four categories; Physical influences, ecological influence, human influence, and sense of place. These categories and their relation to the evaluation framework of this study outlined earlier are summarised in table 4. While the first three categories represent tangible almost intrinsic values in the landscape, sense of place is very much based on a subjective understanding.

The *physical influences* are recognised as the building blocks for the landscape. The geology is recognised and communicated as an inert entity, ignoring its relevance as a value or resource. Topography and hydrology being noted for their aesthetic qualities, missing processes and relationships to other aspects – historic processes are evident.

> *"The rivers and their fast flowing tributaries have cut steep sided rocky cloughs through the upland landscape which broaden into alluvial valleys in the lowlands. Much of the highest land in the upland area of the South West Peak is covered by deposits of blanket peat, which give a smooth rounded appearance to the landscape..."*

Ecological influences in the Peak District LCA clearly express the natural significance of the landscape. Yet what is described is predominantly the physical form, that which can be seen, while relationships are mentioned they tend to be visual relationships.

> *"Wet pasture and hay meadows on lower slopes and on floodplains contain various rushes and sedges, meadowsweet and ragged robin and often support small populations of breeding birds such as snipe. The pastoral farmland, including species rich hedges, supports a wide range of bird species including yellowhammer, skylark, linnet and goldfinch."*

Practices are absent from this aspect of the assessment, both the natural processes and the management processes which create the form. As such it can be said to describe a surface representation of the ecological aspect of the landscape.

The Cultural aspects come to the fore in *Human influences*. This aspect describes the development of the landscape and thus expresses the cultural practices which have shaped the landscape as well the form of the landscape. It is a historic landscape which is represented, missing the practices which shape the landscape now as well as the relationships which people have with and in the landscape. While recreation in taken up it is more the historic significance of the recreation and facilities rather than experience which is recognised. It represents a landscape as experienced by an objective outsider.

The aspect *Sense of place* opens up the discussion on emotive values in the landscape, recognising what makes the place special. These are read as second hand interpretation, how an artist or vicarious insider may see it or landscape as a backdrop for the incidental outsider of the visual attributes of the landscape:

> *"The moorland tops have dark hues due to the weathered gritstone bedrock, exposed in places along the edges, and the dark purples, oranges and browns of heather so important for grouse management. This creates a sense of wildness that contrasts with the brighter greens of improved land in the landscapes to either side of the moors. The lack of settlement or activity*

ensures that the sense of remoteness prevails in most locations, although the edges are popular destinations for climbers and walkers." (Peak District LCA)

As with the all of the assessments, agriculture and the production which is tied up in the landscape is related as a visual entity, rather than seeing it as an economic, cultural etc. phenomena. Relating all aspects to a visual description belittles these other aspects. Those who manage the land and are instrumental in creating the landscape are not taken into account neither the public nor the land-owners as such conflicting values are hidden or ignored. Farmers become creators of a visual aesthetic rather than economic drivers or holders of values. Landscape in this assessment is predominantly a professional projection, with public inclusion acting as a support to professional values.

Discussion

The description of landscape in the 2002 LCA guidelines and how it is conceptualised in the assessments represent the discussion on landscape as developed in academia and represented in the ELC. Yet as is evident from this study, even when landscape is identified as being reliant on experiences and multiple dynamic values, landscape planning struggles to handle it in such a way. Rather than addressing landscape as a lived experience landscape planners, through LCAs, tend to handle it as an objective unit of analysis, representing landscape as a backdrop and predominantly an objective outsider view; contrasting with the intimate experience of those who inhabit the landscape (Butler and Åkerskog, 2014; Stephenson, 2008; 2010). The representation taken up in LCAs focus on form, missing the relationships and practices which underpin the landscape and consequently communicating a neutral surface. Landscape becomes an area rather than the perception of that area, a view of landscape exposed and critiqued by Cosgrove (1984) over 30 years ago. This objective outsider (Relph, 1976) view, results in an entity imposed on the public, representing work by planners for planners.

It would be expected that the inclusion of the public in these assessments would have the potential to open up the values which Janet Stephenson (2008; 2010) identified as missing from professionally driven landscape assessments; based on relationships and practices. However this study shows that this is not the case. In order to operationalise landscape as recognised in the ELC and communicated through the conceptualisations presented in the individual assessments requires an awareness of what forms the basis of landscape action is; what defines the values. This requiring those making decisions affecting landscapes to be aware of the potential nature and range of values affected (Stephenson, 2008), and in turn the conflicts that can arise from ignoring these values. Exposing whose values are recognised places emphasis on the moral and ethical standing of those who imbued values (Thompson, 2000) and questioning the legitimacy of expert defined landscapes.

If planners fail to address landscape as more than just a surface as viewed by outsiders then the nature of what is represented in assessments, and consequently informs decision making, goes unquestioned. This raises the question of whether landscape planners have the tools for addressing landscape as more than a visual surface as experienced by an objective outsider. In the case of LCA the involvement of stakeholders maintains the status-quo rather than questioning the established 'truth'. As Brunetta and Voghera identified (2008), tools alter with conceptualisation of landscape, yet landscape is altered by how those tools are used. Tools used to address the landscape define what values are recognised and dictate the substantive base on which they operate. As such the tools perpetuate the dominant discourse on which it is built.

Expressing landscape as the perceived surroundings to life, gives landscape added impetus and assessments building on this rhetoric gain enhanced legitimacy as a democratic process. However if landscape is still handled as a visual surface it undermines the assessment process, the professionals who undertake them, the ELC and landscape itself. Landscape planning reaps the benefits of landscape as a positive entity, without directly tackling what landscape is. Using rhetoric of landscape as a "an essential component of people's surroundings" and *"…perceived by people…"* (Council of Europe, 2000: Article1a) yet handling landscape as an objective surface continues to privilege the objective outsiders discourse on landscape. Cynically it could be viewed landscape planners are using landscape to strengthen their own values.

Brunetta and Voghera (2008) argue landscape assessment has the possibility to identify values in the landscape, rather than just dictate what these values are. However practice has a long way to go in order to fulfil this potential, questioning what lies at the heart of landscape characterisation; landscape, and how it is handled.

References

Altman, I. & Low, S. (eds.) (1992). *Place attachment,* New York: Plenum Press.

Ariansen, P. (1993). *Miljöfilosofi.* Nora, Sweden: Nya Doxa.

Arnesen, T. (1998). Landscapes lost. *Landscape Research,* 23(1), 39-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01426399808706524

Bergeron, J., Paquette, S. & Poullaouec-Gonidec, P. (2014). Uncovering landscape values and micro-geographies of meanings with the go-along method. *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 122, 108-121. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2013.11.009

Bloemers, T., Daniels, S., Fairclough, G., Pedroli, B. & Stiles, R. (2010) *Landscape in a changing world: bridging divides, integrating disciplines, serving society.*: European Science Foundation/COST, .

Brown, G. (2004). Mapping spatial attributes in survey research for natural resource management: methods and applications. *Society & Natural Resources,* 18(1), 17-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08941920590881853

Brown, G. & Raymond, C. (2007). The relationship between place attachment and landscape values: toward mapping place attachment. *Applied Geography,* 27(2), 89-111. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2006.11.002

Brown, G. & Raymond, C. M. (2014). Methods for identifying land use conflict potential using participatory mapping. *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 122(0), 196-208. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2013.11.007

Brown, G. G., Reed, P. & Harris, C. C. (2002). Testing a place-based theory for environmental evaluation: an Alaska case study. *Applied Geography,* 22(1), 49-76. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0143-6228(01)00019-4

Brunetta, G. & Voghera, A. (2008). Evaluating landscape for shared values: tools, principles, and methods. *Landscape Research,* 33(1), 71-87. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01426390701773839

Butler, A. & Berglund, U. (2014). Landscape Character Assessment as an approach to understanding public interests within the European Landscape Convention. *Landscape Research,* 39(3), 219-236. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2012.716404

Butler, A. & Åkerskog, A. (2014). Awareness-raising of landscape in practice: an analysis of Landscape Character Assessments in England. *Land Use Policy,* 36(0), 441-449. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2013.09.020

Castells, M. (1997). *The power of identity: the information age - economy, society and culture.* . Oxford: Blackwell.

Conrad, E., Cassar, L., Jones, M., Eiter, S., Izaovičová, Z., Barankova, Z., Christie, M. & Fazey, I. (2011). Rhetoric and reporting of public participation in landscape policy. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning,* 13(1), 23-47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1523908x.2011.560449

Conrad, E., Christie, M. & Fazey, I. (2011). Is research keeping up with changes in landscape policy? A review of the literature. *Journal of Environmental Management,* 92(9), 2097-2108. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2011.04.003

Cosgrove, D. (1984). *Social formation and symbolic landscape.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Council of Europe (2000). European Landscape Convention. Florence: Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Davenport, M. A. & Anderson, D. H. (2005). Getting from sense of place to place-based management: an interpretive investigation of place meanings and perceptions of landscape change. *Society & Natural Resources,* 18(7), 625-641. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08941920590959613

de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Eiter, S. (2010). Landscape as an area perceived through activity: implications for diversity management and conservation. *Landscape Research,* 35(3), 339-359. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01426391003746531

Geelmuyden, A., K. & Fiskevold, M. (2013). Conference proceedings: Imaginative landscape identification and assessment: exploiting the pastoral motif in landscape planning. *In:* Newman, C., Nussaume, Y. & Pedroli, B., (eds). *Landscape and imagination. towards a baseline for education in a changing world* pp 405-410. Florence: Uniscape.

Gregory, D., Johnston, R., Pratt, G., Watt, M., J. & Whatmore, S. (eds.) (2009). *The dictionary of human geography,* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Holstein, F. (1998). The values of the agricultural landscape: a discussion on value-related terms in natural and social sciences and the implications for the contingent valuation method. *In:* Dabbert, S., Dubgaard, A., Slangen, L. & Whitby, M. (eds.) *The economics of landscape and wildlife conservation.* pp. pp 37-52. Wallingford: CAB International.

Howard, P. (2013). Perceptual lenses. *In:* Howard, P., Thompson, I. & Waterson, E. (eds.) *The Routledge companion to landscape studies.* pp. 43-53. Abingdon: Routledge.

Jensen, L. H. (2006). Changing conceptualization of landscape in English landscape assessment methods. *In:* Tress, B., Tress, G., Fry, G. & Opdam, P. (eds.) *From Landscape Research to Landscape Planning* pp. 161-171. Dortrecht: Springer.

Jones, M. (1993). Conference proceedings: Landscape as a resource and the problem of landscape values. *In:* Rusten, C. & Wøien, H., (eds). *The politics of environmental conservation: proceedings from a workshop*, pp 19-33. Trondheim: The University of Trondheim.

Jones, M. (2009). Analysing landscape values expressed in planning conflicts over change in the landscape. *In:* Van Eetvelde, V., Sevenant, M. & Van De Velde, L. (eds.) *Re-Marc-able landscapes: Marc-ante Landschappen.* pp. 193-205. Gent: Academia Press.

Jones, M. & Stenseke, M. (eds.) (2011). *The European Landscape Convention: challenges of participation,* Dordrecht: Springer.

Küchler, S. (1993). Landscape and memory: the mapping of process and its representation in a Melanesian society. *In:* Bender, B. (ed.) *Landscape: Politics and perspective.* pp. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Lockwood, M. (1997). Integrated value theory for natural areas. *Ecological Economics,* 20(1), 83-93. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009(96)00075-4

Meinig, D. (1979). The beholding eye: ten versions of the same scene. *In:* Meinig, D. (ed.) *The interpretation of ordinary landscapes: geographical essays.* pp. 33-50. New York: Oxford Unviversity Press.

Muir, R. (1999). *Approaches to landscape* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Paasi, A. (2002). Bounded spaces in the mobile world: deconstructing 'regional identity'. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie,* 93(2), 137-148. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9663.00190

Pedroli, G. B. M., Van Elsen, T. & Van Mansvelt, J. D. (2007). Values of rural landscapes in Europe: inspiration or by-product? *NJAS - Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences,* 54(4), 431-447. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1573-5214(07)80014-5

Penning-Rowsell, E. (1986). Themes, speculations and an agenda for landscape research. *In:* Penning-Rowsell, E., & Lowenthal, D. (ed.) *Landscape meanings and values.* pp. 115-128. London: Allwen & Unwin.

Planchat-Héry, C. (2011). The prospective vision: integrating the farmers' point of view into French and Belgium local planning. *In:* Jones, M. & Stenseke, M. (eds.) *The European Landscape Convention: challenges of participation.* pp. 175-198. Dordrecht: Springer.

Price, C. (2013). Research the economics of landscape. *In:* Howard, P., Thompson, I. & Waterton, E. (eds.) *The Routledge companion to landscape studies.* pp. 308-321. Abingdon: Routledge.

Relph, E. (1976). *Place and placelessness.* London: Pion Limited.

Roe, M. (2013). Policy change and ELC implementation: establishment of a baseline for understanding the impact on UK national policy of the European Landscape Convention. *Landscape Research,* 38(6), 768-798. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2012.751968

Ryan, R. L. (2011). The social landscape of planning: Integrating social and perceptual research with spatial planning information. *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 100, 361-363.

Sarlöv Herlin, I. (2007). Multiple interfaces of the European Landscape Convention: the interface with landscape ecology. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift,* 61, 210-211.

Scott, A. (2011). Beyond the conventional: meeting the challenges of landscape governance within the European Landscape Convention? *Journal of Environmental Management,* 92(10), 2754-2762.

Stephenson, J. (2005) *Values in space and time: a framework for understanding and linking multiple cultural values in landscape.* PhD thesis, University of Otoga: Dunedin.

Stephenson, J. (2008). The cultural values model: an integrated approach to values in landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 84(2), 127-139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.07.003

Stephenson, J. (2010). The dimensional landscape model: exploring differences in expressing and locating landscape qualities. *Landscape Research,* 35(3), 299-318. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01426391003743934

Strang, V. (1997). *Uncommon ground: landscape, values and the environment.* Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Swanwick, C. & Land Use Consultants (2002) *Landscape character assessment: guidance for England and Scotland.* Countryside Agency, Cheltenham, and Scottish Natural Heritage, Edinburgh.

Terkenli, T. S. (2001). Towards a theory of the landscape: the Aegean landscape as a cultural image. *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 57(3–4), 197-208. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046(01)00204-3

Thompson, I. H. (2000). *Ecology, community and delight: sources of values in landscape architecture.* London: Spon.

Tress, B. & Tress, G. (2001). Capitalising on multiplicity: a transdisciplinary systems approach to landscape research. *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 57(3–4), 143-157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046(01)00200-6

Tuan, Y. (1977). *Space and place: the perspectives of experience* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

van der Brink, A. & Bruns, D. (2012). Strategies for enhancing landscape architecture research. *Landscape Research,* 39(1), 7-20.

Whiston-Spirn, A. (2000). *The language of landscape.* New York: Yale University Press.