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The ELC: a challenge to implement

- Article 1:
  - b ‘Landscape policy’ means an expression by the competent public authorities of general principles, strategies and guidelines that permit the taking of specific measures aimed at the protection, management and planning of landscapes;
  - c ‘Landscape quality objective’ means, for a specific landscape, the formulation by the competent public authorities of the aspirations of the public with regard to the landscape features of their surroundings;
  - d ‘Landscape protection’ means actions to conserve and maintain the significant or characteristic features of a landscape justified by its heritage value derived from its natural configuration and/or from human activity.
The ELC: a challenge to implement

- **General measures**
  - To recognise landscapes in **law**
  - To establish and implement **landscape policies**
  - To establish procedures for the **participation**
  - To integrate landscape into its **regional and town planning policies**

- **Specific measures**
  - **Awareness-raising**
  - **Training and education**
  - **Identification and assessment**
  - **Landscape quality objectives**
  - **Implementation**

- **Who? How? When?**
  - In which **policy domain?**
  - **Who decides according to what threshold?**
  - **In which policy domain?**
  - **How to collaborate with different policy domains?**
  - Which level is appropriate?

- **What and how to express?**
  - To identify its own landscapes
  - To analyse their characteristics and the driving forces and pressures
  - To take note of changes (monitoring)

- **After public consultation...**
Q: What is the Flemish situation?

- Introduction to the landscape of policy and landscape policy in Flanders
- Evaluation of the implementation of ELC
  >> Launching Landscape Atlas (2001)
  >> Integration of heritage landscapes in spatial planning (2004)
  1. Analysis of the nature of the participation in the procedure >> content analysis
  2. Analysis of the trajectory of anchor places into heritage landscapes >> GIS analysis
### The landscape of policy in Flanders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy domain (abbreviation) (number of administrative units)</th>
<th>Internal and external agencies and institutes involved in landscape policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services for General Government Policy (DAR) (5)</td>
<td>*Agency Geographical Information Flanders (AGIV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Governance (Management) (BZ) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Budget (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders International (Flemish Foreign Affairs) (4)</td>
<td>Department Flanders International (DiV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Tourism Flanders (TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy, Science and Innovation (EWI) (9)</td>
<td>Department Economy, Science and Innovation (DEWI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training (OV) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare, Health and Family (WVG) (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture, Youth, Sport and Media (CJSM) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Social Economy (WSE) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Fishery (LV) (4)</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture and Fishery (DLV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Agency for Agriculture and Fishery (ALV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Institute for Research in Agriculture and Fishery (ILVO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Agency for Nature and Forest (ANB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Institute for Nature and Forest (INBO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Flemish Environmental Agency (VMM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flanders Land Agency (VLM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility and Public Works (MOW) (6)</td>
<td>Department Mobility and Public Works (DMOW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency Roads and Traffic (AWV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency Waterways and Sea (AWZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency Maritime Services and Coast (AMDK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Waterways and Sea canal (W&amp;Znv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Scheepvaart (Snv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Planning, Housing and Immovable Heritage (RWO) (6)</td>
<td>Department Spatial Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Agency Immovable Heritage (O.E.) – including 5 provincial sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency for Inspection RWO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 potentially involved
- Administration dependent on minister
- **Independent institution**

The ‘competent authorities’

The one in charge
Landscape policy in Flanders

- Agency of Immovable Heritage is mainly in charge
  - → landscape as heritage...

Two tracks
- Protection by law
  - Land use restrictions
  - Geographical: often small areas
  - Thematic:
    - ex. special trees and vegetation forms as landmarks)

  - Inventory ([Landscape Atlas 2001](#)) >> basis document for landscape protection and management in Flanders
    → selection of landscape zones that have heritage qualities
    → formulating Landscape Quality Objectives ([Designated Anchor Places](#))
    → embedded into spatial planning ([Heritage Landscapes](#))
Flemish Landscape Atlas

- Classifies heritage qualities according to:
  - **Relic zones**: vast areas containing ancient landscape structures (settlement, field patterns, land zonings)
  - **Anchor places**: complexes made by related elements sharing a common history
  - **Linear elements**: ancient roads, fortifications, water works
  - **Punctual elements**: monuments and architectural important buildings

**Anchor places**
- Particular unique complexes of clustered heritage elements which form an *ensemble*
- Are representative for a particular period, style or type
- Have a distinct historical, morphological or functional *coherence*
- Have a sufficient preservation condition such that the ensemble can be used as an *ideal example*
- They form core areas for restoring and managing the surrounding landscape.

*Policy makers considered these as most interesting...*
Flemish Landscape Atlas
relict zones and anchor places

Relic zones
Number: 515
530,000 ha
39% of Flanders
Average 1029 ha

Anchor places
Number: 381
221,051 ha
16.3% of Flanders
Average 580 ha

Line relics: 544
Point relics: 4607

Only 2% of Flanders is protected landscape
Procedure: designating anchor places for integrated landscape management

Procedure in 2 phases:

1. Defining designated anchor places
   - Selecting anchor places from the Atlas inventory
   - Delineating on scale 1:10,000
   - Describing (heritage) qualities: natural, historical, sociological, aesthetical + link to monuments and archaeological sites
   - Defining Landscape Quality objectives
   - Consulting the Royal Commission and ‘competent authorities’

   \[\text{legally binding for policy makers and public authorities}\]

2. Integrating the designated anchor place in a spatial execution plan \(\rightarrow\) heritage landscape

   \[\text{legally binding for individual stakeholders}\]
1) *Valleistructuur Waardammebeek-Hertsbergebeek (vertakking Rivierbeek)*
- Bestudigen van spontane erosie- en sedimentatieprocessen (overstroming, oeverwrijving)
- Conserveren en herstellen van kwetsbare natuurlijke milieus (oeverwallen, beekoozers en -beddingen, kwelplekten)
- Vrijwaren van kwalitatieve open ruimte-kenmerken door handhaving van permanent graslandgebruik en beekdalbos in valleigebied
- Stimuleren van historisch en ecologisch waardevolle oververgroeiingen

2) *Parkdomeinen Gruuthuyse-De Cellen-De Herten-Nieuwenhove*
- Integraal vrijwaren van bouwkundige en parkarchitecturale erfgoedwaarden van voormalige kasteeldomeinen, inclusief onderhoud en restauratie van parkconstructies en -ornamenten
- Stimuleren van actief park- en parkbosbeheer, prioriteraar door het herstellen en aangepast beheren van oer- en parkbosstructuren en waterpartijen
- Vrijwaren van waardevolle zichtrelaties en perspectieven

**Landscape inventory, characterisation and spatial structure**

**Landscape quality objectives**

Himpe (2010)
Towards heritage landscapes

- Atlas anchor places ➔ designated anchor places ➔ heritage landscapes

Anchor places in the Atlas (#381)

Heritage landscapes (#11)

Designated anchor places (#66)

April 2014
Towards heritage landscapes

Anchor places in the Atlas (#381)

Designated anchor places (#66)

Heritage landscapes (#11)

April 2014
Designating Anchor places: the legal procedure

**Phase 1: binding policy makers and public authorities**

- Proposal submitted by individuals, associations or any public authority

  Administration (Agency Space and Heritage) makes dossier
  - vision for landscape management
  - formulation of landscape quality objectives

  Royal Committee of Monuments and Landscapes gives recommendations and if no corrections are needed approval

  The Flemish government decides a temporary designation

  Informing and asking public authorities and administrations for advice

  Administration collects and handles remarks, objections and advices

  Motivated advice by the Royal Committee

  The Flemish government decides the definitive designation

  Publication of decision, informing public authorities and landowners

  Start of phase 2

  

**Phase 2: binding individual stakeholders**

  - External input
    - informal consultation of stakeholders in sectors and municipalities and eventually landowners
    - expert's control on scientific quality and validity
    - formal consultation of stakeholders in sectors and municipalities (non-compulsory consultation of landowners)
    - expert judgment

  - Towards Heritage Landscape
  - Public hearing
(1) Participation - who?

Who is participating?
- The Flemish governance level makes the proposal and dominates the participation procedure
- The provincial level is mainly in favour of the proposals
- The municipal level is not always consulted

>> the demand for advice is not systematically
>> important differences exist between provinces and municipalities

How do the policy domains respond?
- Different departments and agencies from the same policy domain are asked to formulate advices
- Concerted recommendations are not always made → contradictory recommendations and advices are possible within one policy domain
- Policy domains with many departments and agencies have a larger weight as they give more recommendations.
  - i.e policy domains Environment, Nature and Energy (LNE) and Mobility and Public Works (MOW)
Participation - kind of answers?

**Involvement of all policy domains?**
- The rule is that no reply within the legal response time of 90 days is considered a positive recommendation
  - most administrations do not reply within this time (ex.: the policy domain Economy and Innovation (EWI) even never replies)
  - some departments and agencies do consider themselves not involved in the matter and reply as such (NA) or send the demand to others.
    - Ex.: Department International Flanders (DiV) → external agency Tourism Flanders (TV)

**Recommendations?**
- In most cases, standard responses with recommendations are given
- Many give recommendations with a lot of comments and suggestions but no clear yes or no
- Many give conditional positive advice (pc) in the style of “we accept, but only when...”
  - this is mostly the case in the sectors agriculture (DLV) and infrastructure (DMOW, AWV, W&Z) and nature (ANB).
- Many of these are interpreted as positive
- Most negative advices come from the municipal level (often as response on criticism by individuals or local organisations); sometimes they just don’t like the interference by the Flemish government in local matters
(2) Trajectory of anchor places into heritage landscapes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Total area (km²)</th>
<th>Mean (km²)</th>
<th>Min (km²)</th>
<th>Max (km²)</th>
<th>% Flanders (km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchor places (Landscape Atlas)</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2210,58</td>
<td>5,79</td>
<td>0,03</td>
<td>40,88</td>
<td>16,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated anchor places (DAP)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>939,86</td>
<td>14,24</td>
<td>0,83</td>
<td>69,92</td>
<td>6,84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage landscapes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19,10</td>
<td>1,74</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>6,74</td>
<td>0,14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- How to explain differences?
  - Designated anchor places bigger than anchor places?
  - Heritage landscapes smaller than designated anchor places?
Towards designated anchor places

Anchor place maintained

Combining different anchor places to make bigger units

Enlarge anchor place

New anchor place
Towards heritage landscapes

Designated anchor place maintained

Perimeter defined by community borders

Only small pieces

Perimeter defined by planning borders
Some figures anno 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchor places (Landscape Atlas)</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Total area (km²)</th>
<th>Mean (km²)</th>
<th>Min (km²)</th>
<th>Max (km²)</th>
<th>% Flanders (km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>2210,58</td>
<td>5,79</td>
<td>0,03</td>
<td>40,88</td>
<td>16,08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated anchor places (DAP)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>939,86</td>
<td>14,24</td>
<td>0,83</td>
<td>69,92</td>
<td>6,84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage landscapes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19,10</td>
<td>1,74</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>6,74</td>
<td>0,14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Anchor places</th>
<th>Designated anchor places</th>
<th>Heritage landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>area</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>517,10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limburg</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>415,07</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-Flanders</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>369,34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemish Brabant</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>426,15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western-Flanders</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>482,92</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occasion for heritage landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occasion for heritage landscape</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#6 Heritage (castle parks, abbey)</td>
<td>#1 Demarcation of harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Municipal spatial plan</td>
<td>#1 Agricultural and natural use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Park management &amp; heritage</td>
<td>#1 Reconversion of recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 1: Park Brasschaat (1st)

- Anchor place (29/7/08)
- Castle park (including vistas)
- Nature area with forest characteristics
- Nature area
- Area for recreation
- Area for services
- Area for gardens
- Sport stadium

Heritage landscape (28/5/2009)

→ Specific regulations for future development
Example 2: Polder Stabroek

Deze overdruck heeft geen eigen bestemmingscategorie maar volgt de bestemmingscategorie van de gronddeel.

Artikel R23. Erfgoedlandschap

Het gebied is een erfgoedlandschap in de zin van het landschapsdecreet.

De waarden en typische landschapskenmerken van dit erfgoedlandschap zijn:
- het open agrarische landschap dat getuigt van de Initieel ontplooiing, met langgerekte tot blokvormige pecsalen en met zowel akker- als grasland;
- de historische wegenpatroon en afwateringsstelsel;
- de oude dijkstructuren: 's Hertogendijk;
- de waterlopen;
- de kleine landschapselementen zoals houtkanten, bomenrijen en rietkransen;
- het bouwkundig erfgoed en het archeologisch patrimonium.

Alle handelingen zoals opgenomen in de artikels R19., R20. en R21. zijn toegelaten voor zover ze het erfgoedlandschap niet geheel of gedeeltelijk vernietigen en geen betekenisvolle schade veroorzaken aan de waarden en de typische landschapskenmerken ervan. Bij afwezigheid van een alternatief kan voor zoi'n handeling toch een vergunning worden afgeleverd om dwingende redenen van groot openbaar belang, met inbegrip van redenen van sociale of economische aard.

Heritage landscape (30/4/2013)

Anchor place (27/2/12)
General measures ELC

- To recognise landscapes in law
  - Yes, in several fragmented policy domains and levels

- To establish and implement landscape policy & planning
  - = strong forward-looking action to enhance, restore or create landscapes → Yes?
  - >> mainly focused on enhancing, protecting (although new developments are allowed)
  - >> fragmentation into several policy domains
  - >> need to pay attention also to “white areas”, everyday landscapes
  - >> more spatial than geographical competence (cf. Hägerstrand)

- To establish procedures for the participation
  - Yes, but mainly expert based

- To integrate landscape into its regional and town planning policies
  - Yes, explicit via heritage landscapes
  - >> But also in other domains: productive landscape, energy landscape, agricultural and natural structure, design of new landscapes, ...
Conclusion (2)

**Identification and assessment; landscape quality objectives**

- **Landscape atlas**
  - is not compliant to the specification of the ELC concerning a full territorial covering and identification of all landscapes
  - >> need for characterization of current landscapes covering the whole of Flanders
  - >> need to go beyond a heritage perspective

- **Procedure towards heritage landscapes**
  - Designated anchor places only the first step
  - Public participation is only included by public hearing in last phase
  - >> need to monitor the implementation
  - >> need for content analysis of landscape quality objectives for the overall trajectory AP to HL

→ **Continuing sectoral approach of immovable heritage**
  - No scenario of shirking down the areas
  - New “VEN” - Flemish Heritage Network

→ **Up to a more geographical, holistic approach of landscape**
  - More collaboration and communication between policy domains on the Flemish level
  - Provincial level as the most integrated, transdisciplinary approach
  - Linking tangible and intangible heritage
  - Landscape as common good
The story will continue...

... But how will it ends?

➔ New heritage decree since 21 July 2013

- Towards an integrated approach of heritage
- Cultural-historical landscapes?
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