

READING AND REPRESENTING THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

A TOOLKIT

1. WHY INCLUDE CULTURAL LANDSCAPES IN DESIGN EDUCATION?

In Cape Town where a clear and disturbing separation between the formal and the informal city is evident, articulating the role of landscape architecture in the latter can be a complex process that begins to question the value systems underpinning the practice of landscape architecture. Although the training for landscape architects is understood - and can be said - to be designed for intervention in the formal city; increasingly landscape architects find themselves working within the informal sector of the city. This is often as part of the government's and city authorities' need to address equity in terms of basic public services provision that includes open space. An analysis of projects undertaken within resource-stressed societies suggests that the landscape architects play the roles of listeners, innovators and facilitators rather than professionals with ready-made solutions to problems. (Finzi Saidi, 2011, former Masters in Landscape Architecture programme convener at the University of Cape Town, South Africa).

This assertion clearly summarizes the situation we face as educators in planning or landscape Architecture in Africa. However, worldwide there is a shift in the understanding of the role of the designer, where now, more than ever, this role concerns adhering to a new way of thinking about problems; one that incorporates a broader research approach in order to fully understand problems as systems rather than individual parts (Caruso and Frankel, 2009). Evolving far beyond the principles of aesthetics and basic form and function, design thinking is now focused on "form and content", fundamentally rooted in humanity (Buchanan, 2001:35). Today, designers must cross multiple disciplines to expand their scope of knowledge and only through this new form of thinking are designers really enabled to face current social problems (Ibid., 2009).

Academically, we are challenged to facilitate a kind of learning based on understanding and solving the contemporary social problems affecting African cities. It has been argued that the 'social problems approach' appears to be relevant in such a context and that it should inform all (design) education. Finzi Saidi (2009) has explicitly stated that responding to social problems should form the basis of designing a new landscape architectural curriculum. This approach is clearly relevant to our contemporary issues. It has the potential to engage students critically and assertively with proposed changes in society - especially those for the benefit of the urban poor. It begins to prepare landscape architects to become agents for change or 'catalysts' as they are referred to by Hester (2005:74). However, focusing solely on "social problems" negates the potential role Landscape Architects have in fostering already strong and healthy bonds between communities and their environments. Thus, rather than basing curriculum development on addressing "social problems" (as defined above), here the focus is on the more holistic and encompassing concept of "cultural landscapes".

This toolkit will reflect on the integration of cultural landscape reading and representational tools used within the current Master of City and Regional Planning (MCRP) and Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA) Programmes at the University of Cape Town (UCT), South Africa.

2. WHAT IS MEANT BY 'CULTURAL LANDSCAPE'

From ideas first promoted in the early twentieth Century, there are probably as many definitions for “cultural landscape” now as there are cultures of the world. By tracing salient applications of the term, we hope arrive at a workable meaning for our context and application. Through his *Morphology of Landscape* (1925), the American geographer Carl O. Sauer further developed the cultural landscape concept into an approach that understands landscapes as areas of natural features modified and influenced by cultural forces. This approach also recognized intangible values and cultural expressions not immediately or physically evident – (ineffable) forces such as literature, poetry, painting and photography, ritual and traditional production. This approach enabled the assessment and documentation of the key values of a particular landscape territory - through research and compilation of the evidence of associative connections. This approach, geographical in nature, served to broaden the notion of ‘landscape’, and enabled the integration of people-nature interactions that were not previously described within landscape terminology. Through this understanding, a cultural landscape is fashioned out of a natural area by a cultural group. Culture is the agent, acting upon the natural area as the medium; the ‘cultural landscape’ is the result. (Carl Sauer, 1925:46)

Taking an alternative stance, ‘landscape’ can refer both to a way of viewing the environment surrounding us, as well as to this environment itself. The appeal of the idea of ‘landscape’ is that it synthesizes the factors at work in our relationship with the surrounding environment into a unity. Landscape, whether of refined aesthetic value or not, provides the platform for daily life – thus landscape becomes familiar. The concept of landscape connects people to nature by recognizing their interaction with the environment and understanding their place within it. As the very notion of ‘landscape’ is a highly cultural construct, it may seem redundant to speak of ‘cultural’ landscapes. Nonetheless, by convention, the adjective ‘cultural’ has been prefixed to emphasize human interaction with environment and to denote the presence of tangible and intangible cultural values associated with landscape (Mitchell, Rössler and Tricaud, 2009:17). By extension, human geographers define ‘cultural landscape’ as “a concrete and characteristic product of the interplay between a given human community, embodying certain cultural preferences and potentials, and a particular set of natural circumstances. It is an inheritance of many eras of natural evolution and of many generations of human effort” (Wagner and Miskell, quoted in Fowler, 1999:56).

Heritage Practitioners employ the term ‘cultural landscape’ to refer to land with its associated memories, perceptions, stories, practices and experiences which give that particular landscape its meaning. A cultural landscape thus provides the essential (physical and metaphysical) context for a range of heritage resources, which can take on a variety of forms, yet is itself a heritage resource in its own right. It could be regarded as the ‘tapestry’ within which all other heritage resources are embedded and interwoven, and which gives them their sense of place and belonging. As the concept of cultural landscape gives spatial and temporal expression to the processes and products manifested by the interaction of people with the environment, it may be conceived as a particular configuration of topography, vegetation cover, land use and settlement pattern that establishes some coherence (or legibility) of natural and cultural processes. Cultural landscapes may therefore be defined as places of cultural significance that reveal qualities relating to aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic, technological, archaeological, or paleontological value. (Overstrand Heritage Landscape Group, 2009:273).

O'Hare (1997:47) also offers his own definition for cultural landscape by stating that “the cultural landscape consists of a dialogue between the natural physical setting, the human modifications to that setting, and the meanings of the resulting landscape to insiders and outsiders. The continuous interaction between these three elements takes place over time, (in a continuous state of becoming). The concept of ‘cultural landscape’ therefore embodies a dynamic understanding of history, in which the past, present and future are seamlessly connected”.

3. CULTURAL LANDSCAPES DEFINED INTERNATIONALLY

In 1972, the Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage was adopted by the general conference of UNESCO. The purpose of this convention was to ensure the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of cultural and natural *heritage* of 'outstanding universal value'. Although the Convention brought together natural and cultural places under one framework for the first time, it initially lacked a mechanism for recognizing sites that were the result of the *interaction* between cultural and natural values; that is, of *landscapes* of outstanding universal value (Mitchell, Rössler and Tricaud, 2009:17). In 1992, as a result of concerted efforts to include cultural landscapes on the World Heritage agenda, cultural criteria definitions were expanded and are shown in Table 1.

For the purposes of World Heritage conservation, cultural landscapes necessarily embrace a diversity of interactions between people and the "natural" environment. For practical purposes, the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (2005) succinctly summarized the process of defining, of selecting and of valuing the protection of cultural landscapes. Three categories of World Heritage cultural landscapes were adopted by the Committee in 1992 and included in Paragraph 39 of the Operational Guidelines (2002). These are described in the table below. During 2005, and again during 2008, the Operational Guidelines were revised and all categories of heritage were included in Annex III of the Operational Guidelines (Mitchell, Rössler and Tricaud, 2009:17).

Table 1: Cultural Landscape Categories

CULTURAL LANDSCAPE CATEGORY	EXTRACT FROM THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION
i	The most easily identifiable is the clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by humans. This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons, which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles.
ii	The second category is the organically evolved landscape. This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two sub-categories: - A relict (or fossil) landscape is one in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features are, however, still visible in material form. - A continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.
iii	The final category is the associative cultural landscape. The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent.

CRITERIA NUMBERS	EXTRACT FROM THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION: CRITERIA (paragraph 77)
i	Represent a masterpiece of human creative genius; or
ii	exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design; or
iii	bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared; or
iv	be an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history; or
v	be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change; or
vi	be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance (the Committee considers that this criterion should justify inclusion in the List only in exceptional circumstances and in conjunction with other criteria cultural or natural);
vii	contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance; or
viii	be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth's history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features; or
ix	be outstanding examples representing significant on-going ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals; or
x	contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.

Refer to the web site for the World Heritage List, a map of all sites, and the List of States Parties:

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list>

Refer to Fowler, Peter, 2003. World Heritage Cultural Landscapes 1992-2002, World Heritage papers 6. Paris, UNESCO. http://whc.unesco.org/documents/publi_wh_papers_06_en.pdf

Refer to the web site for the Operational Guidelines at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines>

Refer to the web site for Cultural Landscapes at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/>

Refer to the report of the Ferrara meeting of 2002 at:

http://whc.unesco.org/documents/publi_wh_papers_07_en.pdf

In the USA, the National Park Service (NPS) document *Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* defines 'cultural landscape' as "a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with an historic event, activity, or person, or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values" (Goetcheus, 2006). Using this definition the NPS recognizes four broad cultural landscape categories, namely historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, historic sites, and ethnographic landscapes. These categories are not mutually exclusive, as each may display elements of the others, but to varying degrees of dominance. Nonetheless, these categories are helpful in distinguishing the values that transform landscapes into cultural resources and in determining the manner in which landscapes should be treated, managed, and interpreted (Goetcheus, 2006). The categories are further explained as follows:

Historic designed landscapes are those significant as a particular design or work of art; which have been consciously coordinated and laid out either by a master gardener, landscape architect, architect, or horticulturist to articulate a design principle; or by an owner or amateur according to a recognized 'style' or tradition; have an historical association with a significant person, trend, or movement in landscape gardening or architecture, or display a significant relationship to the theory and practice of landscape architecture. Examples of historic designed landscapes within the South African context

include the Dutch East India Company's Gardens and Groote Schuur Estate in Cape Town, Vergelegen Estate (notably the Octagonal Garden) in Somerset West, and the Union Buildings Estate in Pretoria.

Historic vernacular landscapes are those landscapes whose use, construction, or physical layout reflects endemic traditions, customs, beliefs, or values; in which the expression of cultural values, social behaviour, and individual actions over time is manifested in physical features, materials and their interrelationships, including patterns of spatial organization, land use, circulation, vegetation, structures, and objects; in which the physical, biological and cultural features reflect the customs and everyday lives of people. Vernacular landscapes can be found in large rural areas and in small suburban and urban districts. Agricultural areas, homesteads, fishing villages and mining districts are examples of these. Examples of the Cape Vernacular tradition of buildings and farmstead layouts reflect a blend of Northern European ideas of order modified by the local climatic conditions and availability of building materials.

Historic sites are significant for their associations with important events, activities, and persons. Battlefields and presidential homes are prominent examples of these. At these areas, existing features and conditions are defined and interpreted primarily in terms of what happened there at particular times in the past (*thus they tend to commemorate an event or person rather than a process of continued use and development*).

Associated with contemporary groups, *ethnographic landscapes* are those which are used or valued typically in traditional ways. These include numerous cultural centres that maintain ties to distinctive, long-established groups with strong ethnic identities. The Kgalagadi Transfontier Park in Southern Africa, together with the associated Komani-San community, is an example of an ethnographic landscape.

As stated before, the above categories are not exclusive: it is very common for one cultural landscape type to be predominant, and yet closely associated with another subordinate cultural landscape type or types. There are always nuances and subtleties at play.

Essentially, 'cultural landscape' can be described as a 'tapestry' upon which other cultural resources, such as historic buildings or archaeological sites are woven. The tapestry constitutes layers of information which overlap and intersect; founded upon natural factors (including topography, hydrology, etc.) and incorporating human factors such as past land uses, built and removed structures, amongst others. Each of these layers of information may endure in whole or remain in part only. The objective in understanding a cultural landscape is therefore to distil each layer of information and to perceive what meaning it reveals (Goetcheus, 2006). Inasmuch as buildings change over time - with the addition and removal of components, and whereby the residue of these changes can be perceived and understood, the same is true for landscape: cultural landscapes record land use change over time. This is evidenced in various ways: should a new building be constructed forcing a path to change course, the outline of the former path still remains; or should a dam be constructed and then a lake drained, the impact of the former shoreline can still be seen. In addition to these static physical remnants that are layered over time, landscapes are also composed of dynamic elements: for example movement of flowing rivers - creating and cutting off channels over time; and the seasonal growth patterns of trees and shrubs that then die-back - leaving their mark which can be studied and understood.

Refer to the National Park Service (NPS) *Cultural Resource Management Guidelines* (<http://www.nps.gov/planning/petr/appdxg.htm>).
Also refer to The Cultural Landscape Foundation (similar categories to NPS):
<http://tclf.org/landscapes/what-are-cultural-landscapes>

The importance of the human factor within 'landscape' cannot be understated. Parks Canada (1994:19) defines a cultural landscape as "any geographical area that has been modified, influenced,

or given special cultural meaning by people”. Without human value, landscape is meaningless. Contemporary post-industrial societies may experience alienation and detachment from the land – an anguish which seems absent in earlier societies with stronger connections to (and traditional respect for) the land.

Thus, the national Australian Heritage Commission (1997) recognizes the “unique position of indigenous heritage” and affirms the aboriginal people as the first Australians, by stating that “their heritage is intimately linked with the landscape, beliefs, and customs. Indigenous people perceive the ‘natural’ environment as a cultural landscape which is the product of human activities over at least 60 000 years - from time immemorial. Indigenous heritage includes those cultural landscapes and places, intellectual property, knowledge, skeletal remains, artefacts, beliefs, customs, practices, and languages that are important to Australia's indigenous people.” This statement could be modified regionally to apply to indigenous communities elsewhere (for example South America, North Africa, etc.) but highlight particularly the strong aboriginal association between place and culture.

The definition of ‘place’ in the ICOMOS New Zealand's new Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value augments the important concept of Australia's earlier ‘Burra Charter’ (1998: sec.22). It asserts that: “place means any land, including land covered by water, and the airspace forming the spatial context to such land, including any landscape, traditional site or sacred place, and anything fixed to the land including any archaeological site, garden, building or structure, and any body of water, whether fresh or seawater, that forms part of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand”. Again, this definition of place need not apply exclusively to the country in which it was produced.

4. LEGISLATION AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

Intangible landscapes, memory and the role they play within cultural landscapes and heritage are concepts firmly anchored in an elaborate legislative framework in South Africa – comprising various international conventions and National Acts as well as organisations instrumental in guiding cultural landscape conservation. Defining the function and significance of cultural landscapes, and the subsequent development of conventions with other legislative documentation supporting their importance - has been a lengthy process protracted over more than a century.

UNESCO and ICOMOS have paved the way for new approaches to understanding, protecting and managing cultural landscapes. During the late 1990s, tangible and intangible aspects in culture became increasingly prominent in multi-disciplinary discussions. Globally there is now an academic, institutional and governmental thrust towards a unified vision of landscape, which continues to focus on the integration of culture and nature, and which incorporates the conservation of the identities of people and places (Scazzosi, 2004:336). The Xi'an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas and the Teemaneng Declaration on the Intangible Heritage of Cultural Spaces have both contributed to enabling ‘landscape’ to be viewed as an integral component of cultural heritage.

The following table presents a summary of the most salient charters, declarations and guiding documents relating to the conservation and management of cultural and intangible landscapes:

Table 1: Cultural and intangible landscape documents

ICOMOS	
1964	The Venice Charter: International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites
1982	The Florence Charter (Historic Gardens)
1983	Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment
1987	The Washington Charter
1990	Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage
1994	The Nara Document on Authenticity (1994)
1996	ICOMOS New Zealand: Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value
1999	The Built Vernacular Heritage Charter
1999	International Charter on Cultural Tourism (Managing Tourism at Places of Heritage Significance)
1999	The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter, 1999)
2005	Xi'an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas
2007	The Teemaneng Declaration on the Intangible Heritage of Cultural Spaces
2007	The Ename Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites
2007	World Heritage Cultural Landscape
2009	The Zacatecas Charter – Cities and their heritage: engagement with integral planning
2010	The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historical Cities, Towns and Urban Areas
ICOMOS – IFLA	
2001	The Buenos Aires Memorandum on Cultural Landscapes and Historic Gardens (2001)
UNESCO	
1962	Recommendations Concerning the Safeguarding of Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites, 11 December 1962
1972	Recommendation Concerning the Protection, at National Level, of the Cultural and Natural Heritage, 16 November 1972
1972	Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, Paris, 16 November 1972
1997	Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity
2003	Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
2004	Yamato Declaration on Integrated Approaches for Safeguarding Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage (2004)
2005	Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape
COUNCIL OF EUROPE	
2004	European Landscape Convention

Intangible Heritage is considered to be a “phenomenon perpetually created and recreated, transmitted from one generation to the next or shared from one community to another”, according to Frank Proschan (2008:9), former president of UNESCO’s Intangible Cultural Heritage Section, citing

‘the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage’ (2003). He continues to quote the convention by asserting that intangible heritage “is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history” (Proschan, 2008:9). In the understanding of this convention, intangible heritage is always *living* heritage: “It must continue to be actively produced, maintained, re-created and safeguarded by the communities, groups or individuals concerned, or it simply ceases to be heritage” (Proschan, 2008:9). As living heritage, therefore, the intangible is based in the past and may often evoke it, but it is manifested in the present and future and lives on in the minds and bodies of human beings, that is, the communities and individuals who are its bearers, stewards and guardians (Proschan, 2008:9).

It is abundantly clear that landscape is integral to cultural heritage. With oral traditions, rituals, cultural practices and cultural knowledge inextricably connected to landscape, its intangible dimension becomes apparent. Thus it is essential to recognise and conserve the relationship between the tangible and the intangible to best provide holistic and sustainable management of cultural heritage.

To date, 132 countries, or State Parties, have ratified, accepted, approved or accessed the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003), a number which indicates an international move towards an increasing awareness of the significance of intangible heritage.

However, within the South African development industry, the realities of preserving intangible heritage are still misunderstood or ignored. Many South African development projects show little or no regard for the role of memory and the meaning of place either in the present or for future conservation policies (Bakker 2003). Whereas current legislation provides broad guidelines on how cultural heritage should be *interpreted*, the field of intangible landscape still remains vague and ill defined.

Only recently did South Africa, with its heritage of rich cultural diversity and numerous examples of highly significant intangible heritage, become part of this global movement towards valuing intangible heritage - by ratifying the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003). Nonetheless, South Africa is a State Party to the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), and legislation concerning the protection and conservation of cultural heritage has developed significantly over the past few years. The following section is a brief synopsis of heritage legislation in South Africa.

Prior to 1994, several pieces of South African legislation served to protect and conserve particular aspects of cultural heritage resources. These were as follow: the Bushmen Relics Protection Act (Act 22 of 1911), the National and Historical Monuments Act (Act 6 of 1923), the Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques Act (Act 4 of 1934) and the National Monuments Act (Act 28 of 1969). The advent of South Africa’s new (post-apartheid) dispensation encouraged the enactment of new legislation to protect South Africa’s cultural heritage more representatively and more holistically. The subsequent White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage (1996) provided the grounding for the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) (hereafter referred to as the NHRA), promulgated during 1999; which became operative in 2000. The primary objectives of the NHRA (Act 25 of 1999) were to create an integrated framework for the management and protection of cultural heritage, and also to encourage and promote participation in and access to heritage resources (Kotze and Jansen van Rensburg, 2002).

Presently in South Africa, the White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage (1996), the Policy on Indigenous Knowledge Systems, the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) and the National Heritage Council Act (Act 11 of 1999) constitute the major policy and legislative frameworks attempting to define intangible heritage and to provide for its protection.

The earlier guidelines contained in the 1996 White Paper were further expounded by the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999). The term “national estate” is described in the NHRA as consisting of heritage resources of cultural significance for present and future generations. It also

encompasses (among others) places to which oral traditions are attached or with which living heritage is associated. As provided by the NHRA (Act 25 of 1999), a number of conservation categories fall under the jurisdiction of the Act, specifically clause (2):

- Places, buildings, structures and equipment of cultural significance;
- Places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage
- Historical settlements and townscapes;
- Landscapes and natural features of cultural significance;
- Geological sites of scientific or cultural importance;
- Archaeological and paleontological sites;
- Graves and burial grounds.

‘Cultural significance’ is defined in the Act as meaning aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological *value* or significance. Furthermore, according to clause (3), a ‘place’ itself is considered to be culturally significant, due to:

- Its importance in the community, or pattern of South African history;
- Its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage;
- Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage;
- Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa’s natural or cultural places or objects;
- Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group’;
- Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- Its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- Its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa; and
- Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

All of the above categories underpin the importance of the intangible dimension of heritage, especially with respect to the biophysical environment. This emphasises the fact that non-physical heritage can be defined in association with tangible heritage, as it adds value and meaning to the material dimension of heritage.

5. SUMMARY OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPE DEFINITION

All landscapes consist of three interrelated components of places:

- 1) Permanent, concrete, and static physical settings – **cultural landscapes**
- 2) Temporary, concrete, and dynamic human activities or behaviours – **intangible landscapes**
- 3) Eternal, abstract, and invisible ideas and ideals as cultural meanings and messages (after Vogeler, 2011).

‘Landscape’ is not synonymous with an environment or nature. Landscape is primarily located in human perception; it is a reflection of who we are and the manner in which we perceive the world. A cultural landscape can be the vehicle for the perpetuation of collective identity and memory. A cultural landscape is the container or vessel of meaning. Often it is the intangible values – the stories, rituals or other meanings attached to a place – which contribute most significantly to its worth. When presented with a project steeped in history, the conscientious Landscape Architect or Planner would endeavour to understand the numerous layers of meaning inherent to the place.

A landscape of, or a landscape as memory can be seen as a process involving individuals or societies, whereby the past is re-interpreted or re-composed through cognitive processes (Spiegel, 2004:3), and where past places are re-implaced and re-experienced through psycho-physical processes (Casey, 2000:210). One might therefore understand landscape and the perception thereof as a result of the process of memory, that is, from a cultural process of remembering to a personal and measurable capacity (Kuchler, 1993:103). Continuity of intangible cultural values therefore requires a tangible materialisation. Memories are based on referents, which are places, landscapes, structures or other elements of representation (mnemotechnic anchoring points). These may be places where the relationship between the fabric of the place and the intangible associations (meanings and memories) with that place to a specific culture or group, have continued through time.

Cultural landscape elements are **markers** that announce and **display** the presence of a cultural group's most cherished **ideals** – to their own members as well as to outsiders. Dialectically, **we will examine the lie of the land**, physically and culturally, to discover what the cultural landscapes look like and what they say about power relationships between dominant and minority groups. These **markers, symbols, and artefacts in the cultural landscapes maintain collectively conditioned place consciousness**. In other words, people produce the character of places and places reflect the character of people. In a city, for example, buildings and streets are seen directly and indirectly in aerial photographs and topographic maps; human activities are seen as pedestrians and traffic; and finally, people evaluate cities and neighbourhoods as familiar or unfamiliar, beautiful or ugly, and safe or dangerous. Despite our best efforts, cultural landscapes can only be understood as outsiders, as travellers, from a distance (culturally and existentially) even though we are actually in places via slides, maps, and words (Vogeler, 2011).

Cultural landscapes are tangible and intangible, dynamic, active, living, inhabited, sacred or spiritual places that consist of an articulation between the biophysical setting, human transformations and the meanings of the resulting landscape as expressed in events, activities, customs, beliefs, stories, or myths, which may be applied to traditional artefactual residue, wilderness or everyday landscapes representative of national identity, cultural groups or single cultures.

Theron, Fisher and Fennel (n.d.) suggest, from an African perspective, that cultural landscapes are:

- tangible and intangible – the landscape as we see it and all the many meaning that the various cultures of South Africa accredit to the landscape;
- dynamic, active – our landscape changes all the time, either through seasonal progression, agricultural practices, development or natural causes;
- living, inhabited – we inhabit our land. People depend on land for their livelihoods. Africans are connected to the land from birth and are returned to the land in death through burial;
- sacred or spiritual places – there are special places where ancestors lie buried, where mothers bury the umbilical cords of their children; places where people pray, collect sacred water, practice initiation, or die in battle fighting for the defence of a cause in which they believe;
- articulation between the biophysical setting, human transformations – Africans treasure their land not only for the ecological value, but for the resources it provides and the ability to sustain lives on many complex levels;
- meanings of the resulting landscape as expressed in events, everyday activities, customs, beliefs, stories, or myths;
- applicable to:
 - traditional artefactual residue – structures, monuments, places;
 - wilderness – the wild places where we travel and visit and where we find respite for our souls; or
 - everyday landscapes – landscapes in which we work, take our children to school, through which we travel, buy food, visit our families and friends, entertain ourselves;
- representative of national identity, cultural groups or single cultures.

6. READING OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

“How can outsider designers acquire the understanding of a place that will enable them to act wisely and knowledgeably? The specific site functions like a partition or container for a muse who may, through design, reveal hidden aspects of a given place.” Girot (1999:59-65).

Tools for reading landscapes should take into account the complexity that characterizes a historical period. Any reading represents a critical process, subject to change, for “we know when it begins but not when it ends, as new objects of concern are added, either due to the changes, discoveries and elaborations of culture, memory and history, or because the methods of knowing the territory change, new sources of documentation are found, new researchers appear. Moreover, the values and potentialities that society and culture attribute to landscape elements change over time.” (Scazzosi, 2002).

In proposing a method of interpretation, Lewis (1996) articulates seven ‘axioms’ underpinning the reading of landscape. These seven axioms are summarised as follows:

- a. Landscape reflects culture, thus change in the appearance of landscape is likely to indicate change in national, regional or local cultures. Convergence in the ‘look’ of different regions indicates some convergence of cultures.
- b. Generally, as clues to culture, the individual elements of landscape have equal importance and relevance.
- c. As ‘common’ landscapes may be difficult to study through more formal methods, popular and ephemeral literature may prove to be important sources of information.
- d. In order to better understand inherited landscape features, we must also understand the cultural context of the people responsible for making them.
- e. Individual elements of a cultural landscape make little cultural sense if they are studied outside their locational context or in isolation.
- f. Most cultural landscapes are intimately related to physical environment (climate, landform, soils, and so forth).
- g. Cultural landscapes are difficult to interpret, unless we combine the actions of looking, reading and thinking about what we see.

These ‘axioms’ can be considered foundational for the reading of landscape, serving to inform more detailed identification processes built upon this understanding. Presently, no universally recognized method of studying, identifying and describing landscapes (nor even a common system of assessing landscape components) exists in theory or practice. However, there is a growing concern to analyse *thoroughly* the methods of reading historic-cultural and formal features of landscapes in conjunction with natural features, as well as ecological and environmental problems.

6.1 Desktop & Archival Research

Preliminary research, based mainly on secondary sources, should be undertaken to provide a critical mass of information aimed at understanding the nature of heritage significance of the cultural landscape, and its context. The first step in the process is to undertake historical research. Material of the following types may be accessed during this phase (Overstrand Heritage Landscape Group, 2009):

- archival photographs,
- archival maps and survey compilations,
- existing heritage surveys,
- secondary (published) sources,
- consultation of resource material and local museums.

A historically informed perspective is necessary to establish the extent to which a building or site could be regarded as representative of a particular period and significant in the area's history.

6.2 Fieldwork

Fieldwork is a vital component of any heritage survey, as it conveys a far more three-dimensional comprehension of place. The understanding of heritage significance at local level is very much dependent on the input (and active involvement) of community based organizations and individuals with intimate and personal knowledge of buildings, sites, routes and places that have special significance at the local level.

Fieldwork primarily entails employing qualitative research methodologies to produce descriptive data, providing information on what people say and how they behave. Methods include:

- **Systematic observation**, where the researcher watches a social space and attempts to record (or remember) as much information as possible.
- **Participant observation**, where the researcher engages in activities, whilst observing these activities, the actors and the physical aspects of the situation.
- **Interviewing**, using structured, unstructured and focus group approaches.

Fieldwork is supported by field notes which could comprise condensed accounts, verbatim transcripts, longer accounts written immediately after fieldwork sessions, diaries or journals, continual and continuous records of interpretation and analysis of findings, photographs and sketches and even found objects and collected materials. It is also important to consider the ethical implications of the research, as described by the American Anthropological Association, below:

Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association

<http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm>

Researchers seeking valid and informed consent will:

- Engage in an ongoing and dynamic discussion with collaborators (or human subjects, in the language of some codes) about the nature of study participation, its risks and potential benefits; this means actively soliciting advice from research participants at all stages, including planning and documentation.
- Engage in a dialogue with human subjects who have previously or continuously been involved in a particular study about the nature of ongoing participation or resuming participation in a study. This dialogue should include the nature of their participation, risks and potential benefits at this particular time.
- Discuss with potential research subjects the ways study participation may affect them when research data are disseminated. For example, if photographs documenting their participation in a particular event or situation at a certain time could prove incriminating if viewed by a wide audience, this eventuality should be discussed.
- Demonstrate, in the appropriate language, all research equipment and documentation techniques prior to obtaining consent so that research collaborators, or participants, may be said to be adequately informed about the research process.
- Inform potential subjects of the anonymity, confidentiality, and security measures taken for all types of study data, including digitized, visual, and material data.
- Seek to answer all questions and concerns about study participation that potential subjects may have about their involvement in the research process.
- Provide a long-term mechanism for study subjects to contact the researcher or the researcher's institution to express concerns at a later date and/or to withdraw their data from the research process.
- Provide, if possible, alternative contact information in case a potential research subject or collaborator does not want to participate but does not feel able to communicate that directly to the researcher.
- Obtain official consent from the human subject to participate in the study prior to the collection of any data to be included in the research process. The form and format of official consent can vary, depending on the appropriateness of written, audiotaped, or videotaped consent to the research situation. Those granting the permission should be involved actively in determining the appropriate form of documenting consent.

- Write and submit forms pertaining to informed consent, and obtain approval by the appropriate committees and/or review boards prior to recruiting subjects, obtaining informed consent, or collecting data.

6.3 Documenting existing conditions

Following the historical research phase, the next step involves drafting an inventory of the existing conditions of the cultural landscape. The role of the whole environment, particularly landform, in contributing to character of place should be regarded as interlinked and interdependent. Heritage issues cannot be understood properly without the understanding of the environmental context. In taking inventory of existing conditions the brief should be to identify landform elements giving places their individual characters; to assess landscapes according to their visual quality, and to identify a network of scenic routes which should be considered for any adjacent development application.

Typically the existing conditions inventory is guided by the historical research findings, especially as related to any specific historic landscape patterns or features. The existing conditions survey identifies any and all landscape elements, no matter from which historic period they arise. It is a current snapshot of the site. Documentation typically includes written narratives and photographic logs as well as graphic maps illustrating the location of landscape features. Technologies such as GIS, GPS and CAD are useful in documenting landscapes and recording data.

The completion of a detailed *inventory form* developed for the study of a particular cultural landscape may follow the international standard prepared by the ICOMOS IFLA International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes (see below). There are also several inventory forms - available from different countries - that may be useful for inventory planning (see box). Particulars of the location, name and history of the landscape are gathered along with details of the existing conditions, ownership, access and legal protection. The historic *character* of the landscape, and the degree to which that character is still evident today, guides the research and documentation of the inventory, and contributes to assessment and planning for the future. In developing an inventory, the researcher seeks to perceive and document the full range of resources that constitute the landscape. Following a comprehensive checklist of landscape character-defining features (as a guide) is a useful approach in taking inventory of cultural landscapes.

<http://www.iflalc.org/inventory/HALS-Inventory-Form.pdf>
<http://www.iflalc.org/inventory/ICOMOS-IFLA-Cultural-Landscapes-Inventory-English-2006.pdf>
www.icomos.org/landscapes/inventory_card.htm

Worldwide basic inventory / register card for Cultural Landscapes
Verbania, October 2006

1. Name / location / accessibility:

- 1.1. Current denomination
- 1.2. Original denomination
- 1.3. Popular denomination (if any)
- 1.4. Address (country, region, province, city) and contact details (phone, fax, email, web page)
- 1.5. Localization with map
- 1.6. Geographical coordinates (latitude, longitude, altitude)
- 1.7. Area and boundaries
- 1.8. Access and transport facilities
- 1.9. Visits, schedules, entrance fees, groups, guided tours
- 1.10. Facilities (shop, cafeteria/restaurant, bathroom, handicapped facilities, etc.)
- 1.11. Events (types, dates, periodicity, maximum people accepted, etc.)

2. Legal Issues

- 2.1. Property regime, administrative authority (also note if a privately managed public area)
- 2.2. Owner's complete name (private, public or enterprise)
- 2.3. Responsible maintenance authority
- 2.4. Legal protection, including urban plans, etc.
- 2.5. Public or private organizations working in the site area

3. Cultural landscape typology:

For more information, please, consult the UNESCO Operational Guidelines Addendum 3.

3.1. A landscape designed and created intentionally by humans (park, orchard, recreational garden, plaza, square, cemetery, promenade, yard, etc.)

- 3.1.a. garden (type)
- 3.1.b. parkland (type)
- 3.1.c. gardens related to monumental buildings and/or ensembles

3.2. Organically evolved landscapes.

- 3.2.a. relict (or fossil) landscape
- 3.2.b. continuing evolving landscape

3.3. Associative cultural landscape: connected with religious, cultural or natural elements

4. History:

- 4.1. Original, successive and current use
- 4.2. Oldest initial date / building and inauguration date
- 4.3. Original and successive owners
- 4.4. Original and successive uses
- 4.5. Author(s): landscaper, architect, gardener, owner (and his/her biography)
- 4.6. Dates of successive recycling to the original layout
- 4.7. Historical and/or outstanding personalities involved

5. General description:

- 5.1. Environment:
 - 5.1.1. Urban/surroundings/rural/agricultural/pleasure/archaeological/other
 - 5.1.2. General landscape characteristics
 - 5.1.3. Environmental conditions description (temperature, climate, humidity, winds, sun incidence...)
- 5.2. Geographical characteristics: vegetation, fauna, regional topography, geology, ecosystem, environmental degradation
- 5.3. Site topography (natural, enhanced, earth shapes, embankments)
- 5.4. In the case of gardens: original and current style
- 5.5. Roads, paths, trails, walking/mechanical ways (design, type, pavements...)
- 5.6. Architectonical elements
- 5.7. Vegetation: (natural forests/plantations: trees, bushes, bosquets, hedges/species specifications, etc.)
- 5.8. Water: rivers/lakes/fountains/ponds/pools/channels/watering system
- 5.9. Perspectives/vistas/views/points of interest
- 5.10. Sculptures and art pieces

<p>5.11. Illuminating system</p> <p>5.12. Furniture</p> <p>5.13. Orientation signs</p> <p>5.14. Fences, limits</p> <p>5.15. Fauna: wild/bred</p> <p>5.16. Condition (excellent, good, fair, deteriorated, at risk, altered)</p> <p>If Category 3.2.a. (relict or fossil landscape) also add:</p> <p>5.17. Archaeological components</p> <p>5.18. Other man made elements</p> <p>5.19. Ancient agricultural production traces on the natural media</p> <p>5.20. Land uses</p> <p>If Category 3.3. (associative cultural landscape) also add:</p> <p>5.21. Agricultural issues or other traditional productions and their effect on the landscape</p> <p>5.22. Traditional productive, transportation or storage apparatus persistence</p> <p>5.23. Domestic, industrial ensembles, energy related systems (hydro-electric dams, etc.)</p> <p>6. Characteristics:</p> <p>6.1. Tangible: setting, geographical, botanical, ecological, archaeological, ethnological, living heritage, maintenance quality, other</p> <p>6.2. Intangible: historical, religious, mythical, social significance, other</p> <p>6.3. Believing, cults, traditional rites, associative rites</p> <p>6.4. Population, ethnic communities</p> <p>6.5. Languages and dialects</p> <p>6.6. Social and economical activities</p> <p>6.7. Authenticity</p> <p>6.8. Integrity</p> <p>6.9. Universality</p> <p>6.10. Isolated or as part of a theme road</p> <p>7. Criteria of selection and valorisation</p> <p>8. Enclosures:</p> <p>A. Up-to-date blueprints</p> <p>B. Up-to-date photographs</p> <p>C. Historic graphic data (drawings, paintings, engravings, photographs, literary items, etc.)</p> <p>D. Bibliography: (general, specific, guides, etc.)</p> <p>9. Enquirer's data:</p> <p>(Name, address, email, phone, responsibility, position, institution, professional or amateur, etc.)</p> <p>10. Card fill-up date:</p> <p>- Note:</p> <p>We highly recommend establishing a centralized Inventory Archive, with its address and management responsibilities listed in this final section, so anyone completing a card can send it to this archive (and thus be able to consult the records at a later stage)</p>

Ideally, the documentation of the various components of the cultural landscape would include a mapping process. The following ways in which the cultural landscape may be mapped could be considered initial points of departure (based on Sen [2002] and the IFLA Cultural Landscape Committee Inventory, <http://www.iflalc.org/inventory/documentation.html>):

- Mapping the formal physical geography (tangible, character-defining features of landscape)
 - Figure and ground theory; linkage theory; place theory
 - GIS, transportation maps, tourism maps
 - Physical and political maps; weather maps
 - Direction maps, schedules and timetables; graphs and bar maps
 - Plans; sections; site plans; interior layout maps
 - Land use patterns, clusters

- Natural systems
- Spatial organization
- Visual relationships
- Topography, surface drainage
- Vegetation cover
- Circulation systems
- Water features, natural and constructed
- Non-habitable landscape structures and buildings
- Spatial character of habitable structures
- Vocabulary of site furnishings and objects
- Mapping cognitive, mental, experiential information
 - Textual maps; verbal maps
 - Cognitive maps; memory maps
 - Behavioural maps; family trees;
 - Advertisements as maps;
 - Grid-narratives; religious maps
 - Paintings and art; experiential maps; soundscapes
- Mapping the intangible values and meanings of cultural landscape (augmenting point 2)
 - Cross sectional mapping
 - Tracking; walking; driving
 - Behavioural map
 - International trade and exchange maps; digital maps
 - Material culture, textual maps
 - Locations for festivals
 - Settings for traditional music, dance, performance
 - Routes of pilgrimage
 - Settings for worship and ritual
 - Places of memory of past events
 - Places of traditional practices
 - Places for the harvesting of native plants
 - Places for the gathering of craft materials
 - Traditional places for experiences at special times of the year
- Mapping historical and temporal information
 - Historical maps
 - Temporal maps; timetables; schedules
 - Timelines and family trees
 - Mercantile maps, weather maps

The mapping of a cultural landscape provides the foundation of its representation, which ultimately underpins a holistic understanding of the area, as well as an inherent ability to manage it.

7. REPRESENTING THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

The previous section specifically dealt with methods provided to enable students to read the cultural landscape. The critical link between reading and understanding the landscape and being able to use this information as a design tool is the way in which the information is represented (through mapping) and the degree to which meaningful community participation is integrated within this process.

The map can be described and understood as a mode of presentation, representation, as an aesthetic object and informative tool. The question that we as designers are confronted with is 'how can the abstract forces shaping and defining cultural landscapes be rendered artistically, spatially and

informatively in the form of alternative “maps” which represent the landscape invisibles?’ In this sense, maps respond to this question to act as artifacts, guides, art, spatial form, images, design tools, metaphors, and, in essence, landscapes in themselves (Amoroso, 2010:xi-xiv).

Kevin Lynch paved the way in combining cognitive agencies with the process of mapping. His focus was on the “imageability” of the city. The urban landscape is described as a combination of paths, edges, districts, nodes and landmarks imbuing the landscape with identity, structure, and meaning. Ian McHarg on the other hand developed methods of capturing the natural and social aspects sites, including vegetation, hydrology, soil, structure, geology, morphology, sun and shade, erosion, areas of sensitivity and other natural components. As his “layer-cake” approach he advocated the separation of these aspects into individual sheets and layered them as individual maps, creating an overall master map to understand the site before attempting to design for it (Amoroso, 2010:41-52 and 93-94; Lynch, 1960; McHarg, 1969).

The Lynch/McHarg approaches were taken one step further by the dawning of the concept of Datascares, especially evident in the work of MVRDV architects. “Datascares are visual representations of all quantifiable forces, which can have an influence on the work of the architect or are even able to determine and steer them.” (Amoroso, 2010:69-90). Through various means of graphic communication, complex sources of information about a particular landscape are not only represented, but also analysed. To this effect, a datascape is a facilitator of information.

Landscape Architect James Corner effectively combined the concept of datascares with the process of mapping, where he advocates that mapping should encompass creative power, knowledge (information) and inventiveness. Mapping is therefore a process that involves a “complex architecture of signs”. It is, in other words, a “visual architecture” through which the space represented is selected, translated, organized and shaped (Amoroso, 2010:94-112; Corner, 1996). He developed the concept of map-landscapes, where aesthetics and empirical evidence combine to form a multi-dimensional map. Key aspects that determine the effectiveness of these map-landscapes are form, composition, artistic license, capturing the correct information, the spatial relationships between form and data, the use of appropriate colour application and lighting, as well as careful consideration of the metaphorical relationship between data-type and presentation (Amoroso, 2010:154-157).

Refer to the following informative blogs and organizations regarding work in datascares and map-landscapes:

<http://senseable.mit.edu/>

<http://www.walkinginplace.org/converge/iprh/index.htm>

<http://www.informationisbeautiful.net/>

<http://urbantick.blogspot.com/search/label/mapping>

<http://bigthink.com/ideas/30868>

<http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/gis/manual/style/index.htm>

<http://www.digitalurban.org/>

According to Corner (2010) mapping contains dual characteristics – the first is an analogue representation of ground conditions and the second is the abstraction of these conditions (codification, selection or projection). This dual function of mapping presents quantitative and qualitative “markings” of the site. This leads to maps being ‘eidetic’ (referring to extraordinarily detailed and vivid recall of visual images). Unlike the purely retinal impression of pictures, eidetic images contain ideas that reside at the core of processes of creativity. Maps therefore become cultural constructs, not simply inert rational data banks, but active diagrams that exert a certain agency over the manner in which the world is shaped - as performance stages that can script certain spatial geographies critically and in fresh ways. (Corner, 2010, in Amoroso 2010:94-112)

Following Corner (1992), Lilley (2002) argues that the act of mapping (and drawing) is a way of actually producing a landscape. By drawing and mapping, a landscape is produced that allows one to see and to begin to understand the form – or morphology – of the physical landscape being mapped.

In particular, the very act of mapping (of producing a landscape representation) allows one to consider landscape as both a material and representational creation (Mitchell, 2002).

Maps as eidetic tools may be applied to the process of participatory design as well, where the interaction with community informs the representation of the cultural landscape and its integration into the design process implicitly. Participatory design is primarily based on various research methods (such as ethnographic observations, interviews, analysis of artefacts, and occasionally protocol analysis). However, these methods are also used to construct the emerging design iteratively. Simultaneously this constitutes and elicits the research results as co-interpreted by the designer-researchers and the participant-users of the design. In participatory design, the participants' co interpretation of the research is not only confirmatory but also an essential part of the process (Technical Communication, 2005). As Ehn argues, participatory design takes a Heideggerian approach to knowledge in which "the fundamental difference between involved, practical understanding and detached theoretical reflection is stressed" (1989:28). This pragmatic approach involves alternating between the two by discovering tacit knowledge, and then reflecting upon it critically.

Community members (as participants or co-designers) are not always able to articulate or otherwise relay their expertise, experiences, needs, or desires clearly or coherently. This is referred to as a user's tacit knowledge: that knowledge which is implicit, or inherently understood, but may not be able to be expressed through words (Polanyi, 1964). Therefore, it is not enough simply to involve users– they must be enabled to access and reveal this knowledge to fully "harness the collective and infinitely expanding set of ideas" (Sanders, 1999). Tools are needed to enhance this collaborative communication, in ways that allow people to visually express themselves through tangible means. When we think of knowledge, we often think of explicit forms of knowledge: things that are written down, defined, categorized, systematized, or quantified. But to understand knowledge making (in this sense including knowledge building in students) in participatory design, we have to understand that much knowledge tends to be tacit. Tacit knowledge is implicit rather than explicit, holistic rather than bounded and systematized; it is what people know without necessarily being able to articulate the basis of that knowledge.

CONCLUSIONS

An appreciation and understanding of the qualities and characteristics of place are fundamental to appropriate design intervention. These aspects, however, are somewhat elusive and nebulous, and thus difficult to measure and quantify. Nonetheless it may be argued that the immeasurable (and intangible) are as important and have equal value to the measurable and tangible.

By utilizing a 'cultural landscapes' approach to recording and mapping socio-spatial aspects of place, invaluable design informants can be derived to help equip responsible intervention. By acknowledging, researching, documenting and mapping the resonant and enduring factors contributing to a locality's sense of place, local identity can be strengthened. By drawing from the corporate and institutional wisdom and collective knowledge of communities in planning and design, ownership of the intervention rests no longer with authorities or consultants, but with the community itself. Designers in the conventional sense now begin to take on a facilitation role, which prioritizes the synergistic (often incremental) evolution of design above prescriptive and imposed form-making. The results are often idiosyncratic and unique, entirely of the place and people that create them – fitting the needs of the community and their environment.

To achieve this kind of place-making, the right kind of information must be accessed. The methodologies presented in this toolkit are intended to facilitate the transfer of information – and to assist designers intervene responsibly and responsively to place and people, towards enhancing socio-economic and built environment quality. In this way, the cultural landscape continues to evolve constructively, facilitating change without losing value.

By the application of cultural landscapes theory to the practice of built environment intervention, we envisage a far more appropriate fit and seamless integration between the existing and the planned' we look forward to a design intervention ideology that strives to 'ensoul' design for people and the environment towards the common good. By generating interventions that strengthen and enhance existing positive cultural values, designers contribute to the development of the shared heritage of cultural landscape – understood, valued and thus protected by all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amoroso, N. 2010. *The Exposed City: Mapping the Urban Invisibles*. London: Routledge.
- Australian Committee for IUCN. 1997. 'Natural Heritage Places Handbook: Applying the Australian Natural Heritage Charter to conserve places of natural significance'. Australian Heritage Commission: Canberra.
- Boeri, S. 1997. 'Eclectic Atlases', in Documents n°3, Documenta X, Kassel.
- Bernard, H.R. 1988. *Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. California: Sage.
- Breed, I. 2011. 'The transient aspects of city life: their understanding and interpretation for design purposes', in Stoffberg, Hindes & Muller, (Eds.), *South African Landscape Architecture: A Reader*, Pretoria: Unisa (in press).
- Canadian Heritage. 1995. 'Guidelines for the preparation of commemorative integrity statements. Canadian Heritage/Canadian Parks'. Ottawa.
- Cantrell, B. 2010. *Digital drawing for landscape architecture: contemporary techniques and tools for digital representation in site design*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
- Caruso, C., and Frankel, L. 2010. 'Everyday People: Enabling User Expertise in Socially Responsible Design', in Proceedings of the 2010 DRS Montreal Conference, 7-9 July.
- Cosgrove, D. 1985. 'Prospect, Perspective and the Evolution of the Landscape Idea', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 45-62.
- Cosgrove, D. 1998. *Social formation and symbolic landscape*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Cosgrove, D. (ed.) 1999. *Mappings*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Conrad, F.C. 1978. *The undergraduate curriculum: A guide to innovation and reform*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Corner, J. 1996. *Taking measures across the American landscape*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Corner, J. (Ed.). 1999. *Recovering Landscape – Essays in contemporary Landscape Architecture*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Crawhall, N. 2003. 'Giving New Voice to Endangered Cultures'. Working paper prepared for the International Forum on Local Cultural Expressions and Communication. Accessed at www.iapad.org/publications/ppgis/crawhall_nigel.pdf
- Ehn, P. 1989. *Work Oriented Design of Computer Artifacts*. Hillsdale, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ellen, R.F. (ed.) 1984. *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to General Conduct*, London: Academic Press.
- Ewing, S., McGowan, J.M., Speed, C. & Bernie, C. (Eds.). 2011. *Architecture and Field/Work*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Fowler, P. 1999. 'Cultural landscape – Archaeology, Ancestors and Archive', in Geja Hajos (Ed.), *Monument-Site-Cultural Landscape Exemplified by the Wachau, Vienna*, Austrian National Committee of ICOMOS, pp. 56-62.

- Giro, C. 1999. 'Four Trace concepts in Landscape Architecture', in Corner (1999).
- Graafland, A. 2008. *Understanding the Socius Through Creative Mapping Techniques*. Delft School of Design Phd & Masters: "Future Cities" program reader. Delft University of Technology.
- Hester, R. 2005. 'Whose politics do you style?', *Landscape Architecture*, December 2005.
- Harmon, K.A. 2009. *The Map as Art: Contemporary Artists Explore Cartography*, Princeton Architectural Press: New York.
- Lewis, C.A. 1996. *Green Nature / Human Nature: The Meaning of Plants in our Lives*. University of Illinois Press. Urbana and Chicago.
- Lilley, K. 2000. 'Landscape mapping and symbolic form: drawing as a creative medium in cultural geography', in Cook, I., Couch, D., Naylor, S. and Ryan, J., (Eds.), *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns*, London: Prentice Hall, 370-86.
- Lynch, K. 1960. *The Image of the City*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Lynch, K. 1980. *Good City Form*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- McHarg, I. 1969. *Design with Nature*. New York: Natural History Press.
- Mitchell, D. 1995. 'There's No Such Thing as Culture: Towards a Reconceptualization of the Idea of Culture in Geography', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 102-116.
- Mitchell, D. 2002. 'Cultural landscapes: the dialectical landscape – recent landscape research in human geography', *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 381-389.
- Mitchell, N., Rössler, M., and Tricaud, P.-M. (Eds.) 2009. 'Introducing Cultural Landscapes', in *World Heritage Cultural Landscapes: A Handbook for Conservation and Management*. World Heritage Centre UNESCO: Paris.
- Nast, H. 2001. 'Nodal thinking', *Historical Geography*, Vol. 29, pp. 74-76.
- O'Hare, D. 1997. 'Tourism and Small Coastal Settlements: a cultural landscape approach for urban design'. Unpublished PhD thesis, Oxford Brookes University.
- Olwig, K.R. 1996. 'Recovering the Substantive Nature of Landscape', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 86, No. 4, pp. 630-653.
- Olwig, K.R. 2003. 'Landscape: The Lowenthal Legacy', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 93, No. 4, pp. 871-877.
- Phillips, A. 2002. 'Cultural Landscapes: IUCN's Changing Vision of Protected Areas', in *Cultural Landscapes: The Challenges of Conservation World Heritage 2002 Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility*, Associated Workshops 11-12 November 2002, Ferrara, Italy.
- Rössler, M. (Ed.). 2003. 'Cultural Landscapes: the Challenges of Conservation'. World Heritage 2002: Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility. Associated Workshops, 11-12 November 2002, Ferrara, Italy, World Heritage papers 7. UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

Saidi, F. 2011. 'Rethinking the role of landscape architecture in urban Cape Town', in Stoffberg, Hinde & Muller (Eds.), *South African Landscape Architecture: A Reader*, Pretoria: Unisa (in press).

Sanders, E.B.-N. 2001. 'A New Design Space', in *Proceedings of ICSID 2001 Seoul: Exploring Emerging Design Paradigm*, Oullim. Seoul, Korea, October 7-11, pp. 317-324.

Sauer, C. 1925. 'The Morphology of Landscape', *University of California Publications in Geography*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 19-53.

Sen, A. 2002. 'Mapping Urban Cultural Landscapes : comparative readings of the built environment as visual culture', Department of Architecture, Ball State University, Muncie. Available at <http://capasia.iweb.bsu.edu/iii/about.html>

Technical Communication. 2005. 'The Methodology of Participatory Design'. Accessed online: http://gliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-4331015/The-methodology-of-participatory-design.html

The Overstrand Heritage Landscape Group (Convenor: Nicolas Baumann). 2009. *Overstrand Heritage Survey Draft Report*. Overstrand Municipality

Theron, G., Fisher, R. and Fennel, C. 2009. 'Towards a definition of 'Cultural Landscape' in a South African context'. Unpublished paper as partial completion of the Degree in Philosophical Doctoral in Landscape Architecture.

Thompson, N. 2008. *Experimental geography*. New York: Independent Curators International; Brooklyn, N.Y.: Melville House.

Treib, M. 2008. *Representing landscape architecture*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Vogeler, I. 2011. 'Introduction: Space, Place, & Landscape', accessed online 1 September 2011: <http://www.uwec.edu/geography/ivogeler/w188/articles/intro.htm>