INITIATIVES AND ATTEMPTS TO
SAFEGUARD DESIGNED LANDSCAPES
OF THE RECENT PAST: THE UNITED
KINGDOM PERSPECTIVE

Despite acceptance of the importance of safeguarding significant heritage sites of the recent past, many cases of landscape destruction and disfigurement continue to occur. To extend our understanding of the progress that has been made in the protection and conservation of such landscapes, this paper analyses recent initiatives that have been undertaken by key organizations. A summary of relevant initiatives by stakeholders acting at an international level is given before those at a national level are reviewed. The paper focuses on the United Kingdom, but international examples are included for comparison and to assist in defining the wider international context.

The importance of safeguarding significant heritage of the recent past within the spirit of recognized international conservation principles has slowly gained acceptance in the past few decades. Nevertheless many cases of destruction and disfigurement of these important landscapes continue to occur, a notable example in the United Kingdom being Frederick Gibberd's Water Gardens at Harlow New Town, Essex (Figure 1). The Gardens had a Grade II* status on English Heritage's Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, but were delisted after their dismantling and relocation. The Grade II landscaping of the Commonwealth Institute in London, designed by Sylvia Crowe, is another post-1945 site on English Heritage's Register, and it is also at risk of destruction due to redevelopment proposals.2 Given the ongoing threats to significant designed landscapes of the recent past, this paper looks at initiatives that have been undertaken by key organizations over the past few decades to extend our understanding of the progress that has been made in the protection and conservation of such landscapes.

INITIATIVES BY STAKEHOLDERS ACTING AT
AN INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

Towards the mid-1980s calls for more recognition of recent architectural heritage were starting to get heard. The International Committee on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) organized its first expert meeting on ‘20th-Century Heritage' in Paris in 1985.2 Soon after this, several initiatives developed, such as the founding of the International Committee for Documentation and Conservation of Buildings, Sites and Neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement (DOCOMOMO) in 1988 and the preparation of the DOCOMOMO Eindhoven Statement in 1990.1 The Council of Europe held a colloquy on twentieth-century architectural heritage in Vienna in 1989, where José Maria Ballaster of the Council of Europe remarked that it was high time to start recognizing the contribution made by twentieth-century movements. In his opinion the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe, known as the Granada Convention, enabled the inclusion of new categories to the concept of heritage.4

An emphasis on 'new heritages' resulted in 1991 in the Council of Europe's Recommendation on the Protection of the Twentieth Century Architectural Heritage, which highlights that this is an integral part of historical heritage, but that due to it being recent, abundant and diverse in character, its significance is less well recognized by authorities and the wider public.5 To avoid irreparable losses the Recommendation requests that governments of member states develop 'strategies for the identification, study, protection, conservation, restoration and public awareness of twentieth century architecture'.6 While the Recommendation appears written from the perspective of architectural heritage, it also applies to landscape heritage.

The Council of Europe explored methods of documentation and ICOMOS prepared publications on the subject.7 DOCOMOMO also started to compile a register of significant sites through national working parties. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) only started to focus on the subject towards 1994, when it requested ICOMOS to prepare a report and organize the Helsinki seminar. This culminated in the ICOMOS ‘General recommendations on the protection of twentieth century heritage',4 which reiterated the value of systematic documentation and, more importantly, highlighted the issues relating to education, training, and the need for research into the materials and technologies of the recent past. The DOCOMOMO Eindhoven Statement echoed such needs and by the mid-1990s this resulted, for example, in several DOCOMOMO preservation technology dossiers. However, similar studies on landscaping materials received little attention. A second ICOMOS seminar took place in Mexico City and UNESCO launched a series of seminars to explore potential sites of the recent past for the World Heritage List.8
While many activities on architecture of the recent past progressed, in general initiatives with an emphasis on landscapes remained largely absent in the 1990s. The Florence Charter of 1982 was the first designated conservation charter for historic landscape remains. In 1995 the Council of Europe published recommendations on the integrated conservation of cultural landscape areas; and in 2000 ICOMOS UK prepared the Oxford Declaration on Landscape. Most importantly, in 2000 the Council of Europe launched the European Landscape Convention, which stipulates that European state parties should undertake measures to safeguard landscapes, including ordinary everyday landscapes, which implies that the measures apply to landscapes of the recent past. The five specific measures to which parties are requested to sign up are awareness-raising, training and education, identification and assessment, landscape quality objectives, and implementation. In addition the Convention encourages European cooperation, joint policies, and public participation in the conservation process and monitoring of implementation. These recommendations show an increased focus on landscapes but the emphasis remained on general principles, with little dedicated attention given to landscapes of the recent past.

The ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes on paper appeared well placed to promote the case of landscapes of the recent past, but apparently did not undertake action on the subject. DOCOMOMO actions on landscapes also remain modest, although promising at times, such as the launch of a DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Gardens and Landscapes in 1994. A session on landscapes was organized at the international conference in Bratislava in 1996, and in 1997 DOCOMOMO dedicated a journal to urbanism, gardens and landscape. The Committee, however, achieved little progress and gradually evolved into the International Specialist Committee on Urbanism and Landscapes (ISC/U+L). These few actions were positive but initiatives remained low key and sparse.

A notable trend within the conservation movement of recent past heritage after 2000 was the development of thematic studies to review various aspects of recent past architecture. This was in line with the approach requested by the ICOMOS Montreal Action Plan, which called for an understanding of the full diversity of twentieth-century heritage and associated conservation issues. Again, the studies featured only a few landscape-themed subjects. However, importantly, in 2005 ICOMOS started an International Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage whose scope includes the whole twentieth century, with the acknowledgement that this may in the future be redefined to concentrate on the recent past.

The Committee strives for more concentrated action on the subject and sees its role as addressing the lack of recognition, technology, materials and design issues, and enabling partnerships. The Committee recognizes that it is ‘apparent that the legacy of the early twentieth century is increasingly understood and...
well managed’ and that the period of the second half of the century requires more attention. It is hoped that the Committee will also recognize that landscapes of this era also need appropriate attention. Documentation on the Committee indicates that present mainly architects and historians are involved and that the Committee retains a focus on buildings. A positive move is that the Committee apparently established links with the ICOMOS Committee on Cultural Landscapes, and now allows landscape specialists to become involved in their work.

With the right membership and objectives for these two Committees, they can hopefully press for the necessary initiatives by ICOMOS. In the meantime only sporadic and modest initiatives continue to occur amongst these international bodies. For example, while DOCOMOMO journals and conferences have looked at different types and aspects of modernism, only the odd paper or poster display on the theme of landscapes has been presented at DOCOMOMO conferences in recent years. For example, a paper by Ann Komara looked at Lawrence Halprin’s Skyline Park in Denver; and Jan Haenraets highlighted the case of Bannockburn Heritage Site and issues relating to its features of the recent past. The full session on landscapes at DOCOMOMO’s Rotterdam conference in 2008 was a step forward, with a paper by Haenraets and Obas John Ebohon identifying key problems regarding the conservation of designed landscapes of the recent past.

Similarly the number of landscapes of the recent past on the inventories and listings of ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO and UNESCO are disappointing with only a small number of sites on each. The DOCOMOMO ISC/U+L tried to take a few small-scale actions forward through its members, such as the DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group’s Urban Register pilot. In 2010 the DOCOMOMO ISC/U+L received approval from DOCOMOMO International to develop a landscape action plan with aims such as encouraging their National Working Parties to undertake landscape initiatives within their countries, and recording a number of landscapes. However, progress remains modest in DOCOMOMO as initiatives rely on voluntary input.

Noteworthy is that the World Monuments Fund in 2010 included the Parque del Este in Caracas, Venezuela, on their List of Endangered Sites. The park was completed in 1961 after a design by the Brazilian landscape architect Robert Burle Marx. It is the first time a post-1945 park has been included on the List of Endangered Sites. While it remains disappointing that the park qualifies as heritage at risk, the fact that it made it to the List is a step forward and indicates an increasing recognition of landscapes of the recent past. The ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage has also established a Heritage Alert project, but so far it appears to predominantly focus on buildings.

It is clear that many initiatives concerning heritage of the recent past were undertaken by organizations acting at an international level. Nevertheless initiatives that deal with landscapes have been scarce and specialist bodies largely overlooked landscapes. It is hoped that new initiatives such as the landscape action plan by the DOCOMOMO ISC/U+L can influence a change.

**INITIATIVES BY STAKEHOLDERS ACTING AT A NATIONAL LEVEL**

The European Landscape Convention requests member states to progress measures such as awareness-raising, identification and assessment, training and education, landscape quality objectives, cooperation and participation. The Convention has been in place since 2000 and several non-governmental organizations swiftly adopted the Convention. The UK government took until March 2007 for the Convention to become officially in effect in the UK. While initiatives mostly contribute towards various aims, these initiatives provide useful headings under which some of the initiatives by actors at a national level can be summarized. After all, the Convention mentions monitoring of its implementation as a measure.

**AWARENESS-RAISING**

Promotion of landscape protection and awareness-raising of the value and role of landscapes, and changes to them, are key aims of the Convention. Raising awareness is a long-term continuous process that can occur through numerous ways and diverse types of activities. It can be said that this process involves two main groups, namely ‘interest groups’ and ‘promoters’. The Convention summarized interest groups as civic societies, private organizations, and public authorities. With attitudes towards heritage of the recent past changing in the 1980s several pressure groups were created as new ‘promoters’ (Table 1). In the UK a national DOCOMOMO working party was founded in 1990; in 1992 a separate group was formed in Scotland. The Thirties Society renamed itself in 1992 as the Twentieth Century Society to become more inclusive of post-war architecture. In comparison, by 1984 initiatives such as the Los Angeles Conservancy Modern Committee had already been launched in the United States.

Before the existence of such pressure groups concerns were sporadically voiced by existing conservation bodies, such as in 1978 when Chester Liebs asked in The National Trust for Historic Preservation’s magazine the question ‘Remember Our Not-So-Distant Past?’. The new pressure groups increasingly engaged in dedicated initiatives, such as the Council of Europe’s 1989 Vienna colloquy on twentieth-century architectural heritage and strategies. Hubert Jan Henket, founder of DOCOMOMO International, and Gavin Stamp, Chairman of the Thirties Society, delivered papers. The ‘Visions Revisited’ conference in Glasgow in 1992, by the DOCOMOMO Scottish Working Group, was the...
first conference to look at post-war architecture in Scotland. It was followed in 1993 by a series of ‘Mind Meetings’. In 1994 English Heritage, together with the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, organized an exhibition on ‘The Age of Optimism: Post-war Architecture in England 1945–70’. In 1996 a series of brochures were published under the title ‘Something Worth Keeping?’ including one on post-war architecture in England. Historic Scotland appeared to undertake fewer initiatives than English Heritage. In 1994 The National Trust acquired 2 Willow Road, Hampstead, the home of architect Erno Goldfinger. The house dates from 1939 and its acquisition was a significant step forward in raising awareness and recognition of twentieth-century heritage. Of similar importance in the United States was the acquisition by the National Trust for Historic Preservation of the Gropius House in Lincoln, Massachusetts, built in 1938 by Walter Gropius. In 1993 the United States National Park Service (NPS) also published a first themed issue on the recent past of the Cultural Resource Management journal.

The emphasis of these initiatives was still on buildings, while landscapes of the recent past appeared to be paid little attention. An exception was the 1989 symposium on ‘Modern Architecture (Re)evaluated’ at the University of California, which aimed to review accomplishments and limitations of modernism in landscape architecture. An early example in the UK was the 1985 book that reviewed fifty years of the Landscape Design Journal and gave an overview of areas of work by landscape architects. In general an increasing number of books on the recent past were becoming available in the early 1990s but again books on buildings and architects were more common than those on landscape architecture. A series of essays and books on iconic landscape architects such as Christopher Tunnard and Geoffrey Jellicoe, and a guide to twentieth-century British landscapes by the Landscape Institute all helped to raise awareness. There appeared to be a greater momentum in the United States with publications such as a bibliography of pioneers of landscapes design; reprints of essays from the 1930–40s by Gareth Eckbo, Dan Kiley, James Rose and Christopher Tunnard; and Peter Walker and Melanie Simo’s Invisible Gardens (1994).

However, publications on the subject remained rare in the early 1990s and, in particular, conservation aspects were not yet receiving attention. Several conferences had been organized in the early 1990s on the subject of preserving recent past architecture, but no dedicated events appear to have taken place on the theme of landscapes until the 1995 ‘Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture’ conference. The event brought together preservationists and designers, some of whose works were considered as key designs of the recent past. The Conference initiated discussions about the values of these ‘invisible’ landscapes and their struggle to be recognized as important works of art. The action points put forward by Charles Birnbaum at the
Conference can be seen as a first attempt to develop specific recommendations for conserving these landscapes. It took a further four years for the proceedings to become available in book form, resulting in the first dedicated book on the preservation of designed landscapes of the recent past. In 1998, in the wake of this Conference the Cultural Landscape Foundation (CLF) was founded by Birnbaum as a new pressure group. The CLF made several papers of the Conference available online to raise awareness and share insights. In the UK the first twenty-century conference on post-war gardens and landscapes occurred in 1998 but focusing on history rather than the conservation of sites.45

Towards the late 1990s more publications that looked at eminent landscape architecture practitioners of the recent past became available in the UK, including the monographs by the Landscape Design Trust on Geoffrey Jellicoe and Sylvia Crowe.46 Similar trends were noted in the United States with exemplary books by Spacemaker Press on landscape architects including Hideo Sasaki and Peter Walker, and on significant sites such as the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial in Washington, DC designed by Lawrence Halprin and the Miller Garden, designed by Kiley.

Academic publications on the work of Kiley,47 Thomas Church and others also contributed to wider understanding and awareness.48

After 2000 a number of events occurred in the UK that further contributed to raising awareness. Noteworthy is the ‘Art of the Garden’ exhibition of 2004 at Tate Britain, which included displays on Barbara Hepworth, Derek Jarman and Ian Hamilton Finlay.49 A nationwide Modern Gardens Open Day was organized in 2004 with the support of English Heritage and the Association of Garden Trusts with the aim of showing that these gardens are an intrinsic part of our tradition and not just some ‘trendy flash in the pan’.50

While many landscape designers and professional practices are involved in conservation-related work, a concern that has been voiced is that professionals often remain unaware of the significance of sites of the recent past and at times cause irreversible damage. Similarly, landscape architects appear not to be speaking out enough about the ongoing destruction of masterpieces.51 Richard Longstreth cautioned in 1991 that ‘if we continue to disregard so much that is all around us, we may waste far more than preserve’;52 and Birnbaum repeated in 1995 that ‘if we allow these losses and modifications to continue – unmonitored by the profession and allied communities – we run the risk of erasing a significant chapter of landscape architecture’.53 The problem is not helped by the fact that landscape professionals frequently struggle to be heard in major projects, which are often driven by architects, engineers, and even politicians.54

At the ‘Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture’ Conference in 1995 it was suggested that the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) and the Landscape Architecture Foundation should formulate and develop a national strategy through a committee of experts.55 In absence of any action as such by 2000 the delegates of the second ‘Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture’ Conference on ‘Making post-war designs visible’ prepared the Wave Hill Charter in which they urged the ASLA to develop ‘national guidance and ethics regarding the ongoing preservation and management of national significant works of landscape architecture from the recent past … before it is too late’, and to avoid the destruction and alteration of seminal works from this period without informed decision making and public discourse.56 The ASLA now has seventeen specialist forums, including a Historic Preservation Professional Practice Network, but not yet one on landscapes of the recent past. Similarly, such a forum also appears to be lacking in the UK and the ICOMOS Scientific Committee on Twentieth-Century Heritage does not yet address landscapes of the recent past satisfactorily.

Clearly many initiatives have contributed towards raising awareness but it is hard to estimate how much progress has been achieved. It can however be concluded that with destruction and disfigurement of significant sites continuing, more awareness must be developed as initiatives on landscapes lag well behind in comparison to progress for buildings of the recent past.

IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT

Improving our general understanding of landscapes of the recent past can occur in numerous ways. For example, work may assist with identification of sites, assessing their significance or, for instance, enhancing our general understanding of the history of the period, iconic sites, designers, technologies, materials or various thematic subjects.

The European Landscape Convention also specifically highlights the importance of the identification and value assessment of significant landscapes. This subject on its own merits a lengthy paper, but a number of general observations will be summarized on the basis that progress could be noted with inventories, databases and registers of sites. In 1987 English Heritage introduced a thirty-year rolling rule for its listing work, meaning that sites from the recent past could be considered for inclusion in registers. Historic Scotland, however, has worked without age restrictions for the inclusion of sites on its Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes since its inception in the late 1980s. Similarly, in 1979 in the United States the NPS adopted Criteria Consideration G for evaluating and nominating properties that had achieved significance within the past fifty years for the National Register of Historic Places.57 By August 2008 there were 1,597 sites on English Heritage’s Register, including fourteen post-1945 sites (less than 1%).58 In 2007 Historic Scotland’s Inventory
listed 386 sites including five sites (1.3%) with significant main phases from post-1945. In 2008 the number of sites on the National Register in the United States was 88,887 including about 2,500 sites (3%) that had been listed under Criteria G. Of particular interest is that by 2008 UNESCO’s World Heritage List included 878 places of outstanding universal value, with eight post-1945 properties (1%). Percentages remain very low for landscapes of this era, particularly as since 1945 we have built at a faster pace than ever before.

Publications help raise awareness, but also as research documents they assist with identification and understanding. In the 1990s, in addition to the history of the period, key sites and designers, publications included academic research on the theory and design of the modern garden movement. The number of initiatives in the UK remained however limited until after 2000 when the Garden History Society (GHS) published several papers of the first conference on the history of twentieth-century landscapes and gardens in its journal, and launched an online collaborative research project to compile a history of post-war gardens. Around the same time Janet Waymark, Jane Brown and Michael Spens published books on the subject of famous gardens throughout the world from the modernist period. Contributions towards widening understanding were also made through research on key designers, such as John Brookes, Finlay, and Eric Lyons and Span.

The DOCOMOMO Scottish National Group together with the Edinburgh College of Art developed the New Town Inventarisation Project. English Heritage launched thematic landscape research, but projects on recent past landscapes appear to have been limited to landscapes of post-war housing developments. It seems again that in the United States thematic research occurred sooner and was more numerous. For example, campus design had already received attention at the conference on ‘Preserving the Recent Past’ in 1995 and was further explored at the conference at Wave Hill, while towards the late 1990s publications had already started to raise the significance of playground design (Figure 2). Recreation landscapes and visitor facilities such as the Mission 66 visitor centres of the NPS and their landscaping were also researched, while similar studies remained absent in the UK. The National Trust for Scotland’s 1960s construction programme under the philosophies of ‘History on the Spot’ and the ‘chain-link’ system for road travellers would warrant similar UK research before all visitor centres of that era have been redeveloped or demolished.

Studies on technologies and materials, such as on new uses of concrete, are essential to assist conservation, but few such studies were undertaken that focused on developing a practical understanding of new materials and the arising conservation issues. Much more progress was made regarding the variety of documentation that became available on conservation challenges with technologies and materials used in buildings of the recent past. For instance, in the United States the ‘Preserving the Recent Past’ Conference was organized by the NPS together with the Preservation Education Foundation and the Association for Preservation Technology International, and studied many technological issues. The NPS Technical Preservation Services attempted to develop an online database on recent past materials, their repair and maintenance which resulted in 1995 in a book which has been seen as ‘the first in-depth survey of important construction materials used since 1900’. In the UK English Heritage set up case studies and organized the ‘Modern Matters’ and ‘Preserving post-war heritage’ conferences, with a focus on the care and conservation of post-war listed buildings. In the meantime DOCOMOMO International elaborated various technological dossiers for materials used in buildings of the recent past. While some of the findings apply to landscaping materials, there still remains a major need for studies on the subject of technological challenges with landscaping materials and planting for recent past landscapes.

Catalogues of landscape records also play a crucial role in identification, assessment and understanding. The GHS retains a catalogue of its library and a garden history bibliography and the Royal Horticultural Society has library resources and an online horticultural database. The Landscape Institute compiled a library that includes major collections of drawings and papers, including those of Geoffrey Jellicoe, Peter Shepheard and Sylvia Crowe. Universities at times hold important collections, such as the drawings and papers by Frank Clark at the University of Edinburgh. Nevertheless, there is not yet a dedicated UK catalogue for landscape records from this period. The Pioneers Project is such a catalogue of landscape records in the United States, and has been compiled since 1987. This project gathers interviews, videos, images, writings, and articles about practitioners and resulted in several books. The Historic American Landscapes Survey also started to document sites from the recent past and the Contemporary Landscape Design Collection at Dumbarton Oaks now even holds key records of European practitioners, including Finlay.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION

By 1948 two major problems for the future of the maintenance of designed landscapes had been raised, namely the commitment of authorities to spend sufficient money on maintenance and the need for an adequate maintenance force with the proper skills. In 2003 a report mapped the current and future needs of the botanic and historic gardens sector and showed that the industry is now ‘at severe risk from an increasing shortage of vital skills’. The measures in the European Landscape Convention recognize this trend and national parties are requested to promote training in landscape appraisal and operations, landscape policy, protection, management and planning,
and school and university courses in the relevant subject areas.

In the UK leading horticultural organizations established a partnership to address the sector's skills problems and in 2005 at the Green Skills Summit agreed eight goals. Since then, initiatives including the Historic and Botanic Garden Bursary Scheme, the Green Skills Careers Marketing Initiative and websites encouraging careers in horticulture and landscape architecture have been launched. The Heritage Protection Review White Paper states that English Heritage 'will implement a new programme of training, support and capacity building for English local authorities and local heritage organizations', which has already resulted in the new Historic Environment Traineeship Scheme.

These initiatives must be applauded but among the large number of learning programmes that have occurred there are still few that focus specifically on the subject of landscapes of the recent past. Many of the horticultural principles and methods taught in existing courses provide a sound basis, but a degree of specific training for sites of the recent past is required. Events such as the post-war gardens workshops in 2002 or the six-day Garden History Summer School in 2003 on twentieth-century gardens ideally should occur more frequently. Similarly, academic institutions must be encouraged to explore the subject, as was done by Harvard University’s Graduate School of Design in Boston at the seminar and exhibition on ‘Constructing the Swiss Landscape’ in 2006 (Figure 3). The same is true for the annual conference of the European Council of Landscape Architecture Schools (ECLAS), which in 2003 looked at landscape architecture and modernism. In contrast, in the United States the CLF continues under its 'Stewardship through Education' banner a constant stream of initiatives for classroom education, the wider public and specialists.

**LANDSCAPE QUALITY OBJECTIVES**

The European Landscape Convention highlights the need to promote landscape management, which is defined in the Convention as 'action, from a perspective of sustainable development, to ensure the regular upkeep of a landscape, so as to guide and harmonize changes which are brought about by social, economic and environmental processes'. The Convention, therefore, asks public authorities to formulate landscape quality objectives and aspirations of the public for the landscape features in their surroundings.

Plenty of examples of sites that are being well cared for can be found, such as privately owned and managed properties. For instance the Garden of Cosmic Speculation at Portrack, Scotland, by Charles Jencks and Maggie Keswick is a fine example of a significant site of the recent past that continues to thrive and develop. Sadly, often the management of sites is poor or surrounded by controversies. The case of the Water Gardens in Harlow New Town has already been mentioned. It illustrates how subjective the decisions regarding quality objectives and the management of sites can be. Even though the Water Gardens were listed by English Heritage, the local authorities gave approval for the dismantling and relocation of the gardens. The
proposed redevelopment of the Commonwealth Institute in London faces similar concerns while in the meantime poor maintenance undermines its conservation and may encourage demolition through neglect (Figure 4).92

In the UK some charitable trusts were founded to safeguard a particular site, as is the case for the Little Sparta Trust, founded in 1995 (Figure 5), and the Gibberd Garden Trust, founded after Sir Frederick Gibberd’s death in 1984. There are also many cases where charitable organizations that manage sites have added new recent past layers to the sites in contemporary or traditional styles, which became significant in their own right. For example, in the 1950s the National Trust for Scotland created new formal parterres in Pitmedden Garden in Aberdeen and since 1945 constructed several visitor centres associated with landscaping, such as at the Bannockburn Battlefield Heritage Site, laid out in a modernist fashion in the 1960s. Organizations, however, appear frequently not to recognize the significance of some of these recent past layers, leading to poor conservation.

At times, landscape professionals and specialists remain unaware of the values of landscapes of the recent past, resulting in damaging redevelopment proposals. For example, at the Lincoln Centre in New York, Kiley, the designer of the original landscaping, pointed out that the plane trees needed to have their tops clipped in order to achieve the intended horizontal effect, but his advice was ignored by New York’s Department of Parks and Gardens.93 Exemplary work by professionals can inspire other specialists.

For example, the historic landscape surveys and conservation visions by Land Use Consultants for the garden at Sanderson Hotel Courtyard in London,94 the Gibberd Garden in Harlow New Town (Figure 6),95 and Turn End in Haddenham illustrate that existing conservation methodologies can be applied to landscapes of the recent past.96

Budgetary restrictions often mean that conservation planning takes its time. For example, the Little Sparta Trust had developed landscape proposals in the mid-2000s but funding to commission a management plan was only in place in 2010. Sadly, in some cases a conservation plan continues to be seen as a bothersome and limiting exercise, as can be illustrated by the 2004 proposed redevelopment by the National Trust for Scotland of the Bannockburn Battlefield Heritage Site and 1960s landscape concept (Figure 7). The proposals suggested the demolition of the 1960s features, while no conservation management plan was in place and without an assessment of the significance of its twentieth-century features.97 The proposals did not gain support and in 2010 new proposals for an upgrade of the facilities by 2014, the 700th Anniversary of the battle, were being developed; hopefully on the basis of a conservation plan.

COOPERATION AND PARTICIPATION

The key factor that ultimately determines the success and failure of the heritage conservation has been described as partnership.98 The European Landscape Convention underlines the importance of cooperation and encourages
this within an international context while also asking for the participation of local and regional authorities and the general public. In general, most conservation organizations actively work in partnership with others and undertake networking. Many of the initiatives described above illustrated cooperation and participation, but there remains scope for further enhancement.
Cooperation, however, does not need to be overly complex. For instance, pressure groups and specialists worked together at numerous conferences, as for instance for the 'Informed Decisions in the Material World', 'Misfits of Modernism' and 'Recent Past Toolbox' sessions at the National Preservation Conference of The National Trust for Historic Preservation in Pittsburgh. Cooperation can also be easily encouraged by sharing offices as occurs at Cowcross Street, London, where the Twentieth Century Society, DOCOMOMO UK, the GHS and others are all based in office space provided by Alan Baxter and Associates. The internet has also become a straightforward tool for cooperation and participation. Examples are plentiful, such as the already mentioned online collaborative project by the GHS. Nevertheless, in the UK the internet remains an untapped resource for this subject.

Research also made clear that interaction and cooperation between different strands of landscape professionals should improve for the benefit of recent past sites. Landscape conservation professionals and landscape architects often appear to be working in vacuums. Landscape architects tend to approach projects from a creative perspective and often appear less in tune with the demands of conservation. As a result landscape designers at times damage significant sites. Similarly, conservation specialists often approve poor design interventions. Professional membership groups and courses should aim to bridge this gap. The LE:NOTRE network project that brings together European landscape architecture schools can potentially assist in bridging gaps between professionals through changes in teaching and research. For example, landscape design students still seem to receive limited landscape history and conservation modules as part of their training.

Concerns about participation have also been raised in regard to consultation with original designers. Lawrence Halprin spoke out about the importance of involving, where still possible, the original designers in the preservation process and voiced how many designers were upset about being overlooked. With many significant designers now at a veteran age, it would be a missed opportunity not to record their stories. Original designers have mostly clear views about the preservation or loss of their designs. Halprin, for example, highlighted that not everything is worthy of preservation and had his own ideas about the values that should be taken into consideration when making decisions. Laurie Olin agreed that we should 'preserve some, yes, but improve, add to, and let some go'.

Similarly local participation and consultation with the wider public must be part of redevelopment projects. In The Power of Place English Heritage emphasized that people wish to be involved but are all too often excluded and remain powerless, while everyone has a duty as well a right to know and participate. English Heritage highlighted that 'if the barriers to involvement can be overcome, the historic environment has the potential to strengthen the sense of community and provide a solid basis for neighbourhood renewal'. Given that many
landscapecs of the recent past are located in urban environments, they can play a significant role for communities.

The wider public should though not only be involved through consultation as it often plays a key part in conservation through volunteer participation. The online collaborative research by the GHS involves volunteers, as do local trusts such as the Gibberd Garden Trust and Little Sparta Trust. In the United States the Recent Past Preservation Network lists areas for volunteer support such as preparing nominations for registers, keeping local forums and bulletin boards, coordinating on-line petition pages, preparing documentation about sites at risk, writing editorial pieces, collecting images, assisting with archives and databases, website work, membership recruiting, networking and so on. There certainly remains scope in the UK to expand volunteer support and public involvement in the conservation of landscapes of the recent past.

CONCLUSION

These findings confirm that progress has been made and that many valuable initiatives have been undertaken in recent decades that directly or indirectly contributed towards the conservation of landscapes of the recent past. Nevertheless, many sites continue to be damaged or lost and more efforts are required to achieve for these landscapes the objectives of recommendations such as those found in the European Landscape Convention. In the UK activities relating to landscapes of the recent past also lag behind in comparison to actions undertaken to safeguard buildings and in comparison to progress observed in the United States. Lessons should therefore be learned from expertise in other disciplines and countries to develop actions and close the gap. For instance, experiences within the European perspective can be further analysed and compared with these findings. Based on this research it is, however, possible to make a number of suggestions for actions that should be considered within the UK context.

Firstly, it is important to recognize that many of the key issues are not specific to landscapes of the recent past and are generic to the conservation of landscapes of any period. It must also be noted that, while the research looked mainly at parks and gardens, designed landscapes of the recent past contain a wide range of other landscape types such as agricultural
and industrial landscapes, forestry, recreational landscapes and housing landscapes. Therefore many of the issues and challenges can be addressed by implementing general best practice in conservation and by following recommended conservation methodologies and principles for any of these sites. Standard conservation methods are all too often ignored for landscapes of the recent past. The fact that few of these landscapes have been included in official inventories of significant sites may contribute to the belief that conservation principles and methodologies should not be applied to sites of the recent past. The inclusion of more sites on inventories might in the long-term help to tackle this, but in the meantime governmental bodies and local authorities should insist that for sites of potential significance an assessment occurs before decisions are taken that might affect the sites' integrity and authenticity. Most importantly, landscape and conservation specialists must recognize that the existing conservation methodologies also apply to sites of the recent past and integrate relevant approaches into redevelopment projects. It is ironic that landscape professionals often destroy important landscape sites. Instead they should do more to promote and protect their work and the values of these landscapes.

Secondly, the findings confirmed that there are a large number of organizations and stakeholders in the UK that are involved in the process of conservation and management of these sites, but it became clear that key organizations are undertaking hardly any designated initiatives. These key stakeholders should reflect on what their role is and what they could do, and start to incorporate more actions into their activities. This brings us however to the issue that many organizations rely on voluntary support or, as in the case of English Heritage and Historic Scotland, they have seen their resources diminish dramatically in recent years as a result of cuts in government spending. As a result it appears that little progress can be achieved by these organizations in the short-term. A key recommendation is, therefore, that consideration should be given to setting up a UK recent past landscapes steering group as a collaborative initiative and to coordinate efforts. With fewer resources available it becomes even more important to strive for more cooperation and partnerships to achieve higher efficiency of efforts, avoid duplication and set joined targets. It could be said that there is even a need in the UK to have a type of overarching landscape forum to coordinate landscape efforts more; in absence of such a forum, establishing a steering group on recent landscapes appears needed. A comparative initiative occurred in 2004 when a steering group of partner organizations was created to address the issues in relation to the increasing shortage of skills in historic and botanic gardens. This initiative has already resulted in a project to map careers, occupations and skills required for the management and maintenance of botanic and historic gardens, and the launch of the

Historic and Botanic Garden Bursary Scheme with the support of the Heritage Lottery Fund. Regarding membership, representatives could participate from, for instance, the Twentieth Century Society, GHS, Landscape Institute, Royal Horticultural Society, ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO, Association of Gardens Trusts, Parks and Gardens UK Database and landscape-related courses. It would be essential to have participation from organizations that own and manage sites, such as the National Trust, National Trust for Scotland, An Taisce, the Gibberd Garden Trust or the Little Sparta Trust. Highly important would be the involvement of government bodies such as English Heritage, Historic Scotland and Cadw, as through the work of the group several key objectives can be progressed that such bodies presently cannot achieve on their own. Their involvement would also allow the work of the group to be integrated in their governmental responsibilities as is, for instance, the case with the actions by English Heritage within the Historic and Botanic Gardens Bursary Scheme. The steering group similarly provides a platform and stimulant for non-governmental organizations to enhance their actions. A group of partners will also have a louder voice as a pressure group and can help to increase the interdisciplinary cooperation between landscape architects and conservation specialists.

Thirdly, the development of a national strategy for the UK is also recommended. At present it is not clear how initiatives by individual organizations relate to overarching targets. A steering group would be well placed to develop such a strategy. It was mentioned that DOCOMOMO IISC/U4 is currently working on a landscape action plan to encourage DOCOMOMO’s National Working Parties to undertake landscape initiatives. A UK strategy can be informed by such initiatives and tap into the work of key organizations.

Fourthly, the research also confirmed that inventories of key sites are still at an infant stage and that cataloguing of records and special collections is still needed. A steering group could again play a role in pulling efforts together and setting joined objectives. The preparation of a catalogue of records could be coordinated by a steering group, but should be hosted by an existing and accessible archive. Regarding inventory work, the Garden and Parks UK Database already listed over 120 post-war sites when it was relaunched in 2009, following completion of the Heritage Lottery Fund supported project. These data can potentially be further developed and records of other organizations added. Lessons should be learned from projects such as the Urban Register pilot and New Town Inventarisation Project to develop methods to include sites, in particular groups of sites. The recommendation from the Heritage Protection Review to work towards a new single national designation system should also be taken into account when working towards a more comprehensive recent past landscapes database. The steering group could establish a formal working relationship with governmental
bodies to assist them with the selection of sites for official listing, in a manner that, for instance, DOCOMOMO provides advice to UNESCO.

Fifthly, the availability of a database of sites and a catalogue of records and research material would make it possible to develop educational activities and raise awareness. For instance a new designated website could host an online bibliography and catalogue of records, overviews of key designers, a timeline of sites, overviews of initiatives, links to the database of sites, and heritage alert pages. There remains a need for more research to better understand the wider context and UK perspective, including the practical challenges at sites, technological and material challenges and the theory and history of landscapes of the recent past. Individual organizations and researchers will continue to undertake initiatives that contribute to this, but a steering group could set strategic targets for research and retain a bibliographic record of research.

Finally, specialized training and learning events should be held or could be incorporated in existing programmes. The advantage of a steering group will be that partnerships can easily be established for this purpose and opportunities within existing programmes such as the Historic and Botanic Gardens Bursary Scheme can be explored.

A key challenge is to find funding that would allow for the creation of projects to tackle some suggestions speedily. Funding bids could be made as a group of partners to, for instance, the Heritage Lottery Fund. Potentially a project could aim to address various of these recommendations, including adding a significant number of sites to the Garden and Parks UK Database, creating a UK catalogue of records, setting up a UK recent past landscapes website, organizing educational and training programmes, and increasing awareness and recognition amongst the wider public of the values of landscapes of recent past landscapes.

To improve the conservation of landscapes of the recent past and to halt the ongoing destruction and disfigurement of important landscapes it is hoped that progress can be made to address existing calls for measures and action, and to implement the suggestions from this paper. That way the measures of the European Landscape Convention can also be achieved for these landscapes, so that this heritage of the recent past can evolve appropriately to be enjoyed in the distant future.
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